



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

WIDENER LIBRARY



HX 11R4 E

*Report of the Proceedings
of the 24th Annual Con-
vention of the Zionist
Organization of America*

Harvard College Library



The
Coleman Silbert
Judaica
Book Fund

Established in loving memory of
Coleman Silbert A.B. 1913, LL.B. 1916
by his family

Michael Smith Rappel



REPORT *of the*
**Proceedings of the 24th Annual
Convention of the Zionist
Organization of America**

**Held in Cleveland,
June 5, 6, 7, 8, 1921**

*Prepared by Maurice Samuel from the Official Stenographic
Report of the National Shorthand Reporting Committee*

**Issued by the
Zionist Organization of America
55 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.**

August, 1921

Price \$5.00

9012487



560 313
Silbert

FIRST SESSION

HELD AT THE CLEVELAND HOTEL, SUNDAY, JUNE 5TH.

The Convention was opened by the President, Judge Julian W. Mack.

JUDGE MACK: We are awaiting our distinguished visitors before formally opening the Convention.

I have appointed Dr. Friedenwald, the Vice-President of the Zionist Organization of America; Rabbi Solomon Goldman, of Cleveland, and Mr. Herman Conheim, of New York, as a committee to escort the guests to the Convention.

The Mayor of Cleveland is out of town. His representative, Mr. Blossom, Director of Public Welfare of the City of Cleveland, who is compelled by another engagement to leave us shortly, will now be presented to you, so that he may keep his engagement and at the same time extend the welcome of the City of Cleveland to this Convention.

MR. BLOSSOM: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is most unfortunate that the Mayor of this city, Mr. W. F. Fitzgerald, is not here to greet you to the City of Cleveland today. If he were here, you would have had the opportunity of hearing a most eloquent welcome. In his absence I have been asked to come here to extend to you the greetings of this community. We are glad to have you here. We feel sure that after you have been with us a few days or a few hours, you will know that Cleveland is a fine city to hold a Convention in.

I regret that the Mayor is not here, because his address of welcome would have been eloquent. Mine cannot be so, but I know that the sincerity of a welcome is not gauged by its eloquence, and you will know, therefore, that my welcome to you today is most sincere in spite of its lack of eloquence.

I hereby extend to you the welcome of the City of Cleveland, the keys of the City of Cleveland, the enjoyment of its parks, playgrounds, farms, anything else you can find, in fact, even the workhouse, if you want it. (Applause.)

I regret exceedingly that another engagement has caused me to ask your Chairman that I be permitted to come to the point of order and make my short address of welcome to you before the Convention proceedings began but it was of necessity that I did so.

I thank you very much for giving me this attention and I assure you that I hope your Convention is a wonderful success, as I am sure it will be.

At this point Dr. Weizmann and his associates entered and the audience broke into a tremendous demonstration which lasted for five minutes and ended with the singing of the Hatikvah.

THE CHAIRMAN: I now declare the twenty-fourth annual Convention of the Zionist Organization of America open.

Fellow Zionists, let me first officially in your name bid the distinguished

guests from Europe and from Palestine welcome to this session of an integral part of the World Zionist Organization, the Zionist Organization of America. (Applause.)

I regret that it is at this time and under these circumstances and with these conflicts raging in our own organization that their first visit is paid. I regret that they could not have been here under happier circumstances and at a happier time. The forces of the Zionist Organization of America are divided and they have been divided for some time past, and because of that division, clear, plain speech on the part of everyone has to be expected. And I should be derelict in my duty to you as your elected President were I to fail to state as clearly as it is in my power to state it, the situation that confronts us today in this organization and the problems, the serious and difficult problems that are to be determined by you, the authoritative body that has heretofore spoken, and that will speak in these sessions, the word of authority for the members of the Zionist Organization of America.

I regret that at this most critical and important session I have no carefully prepared address to deliver to you, and I have none because the situation has been changing from day to day, from week to week, and again from hour to hour. During the past two months and up to this very morning, I have hoped and hoped and hoped for peace, peace in our own ranks. Peace in our own ranks, peace between us and the World Organization. I have hoped for it before Dr. Weizmann and his associates came. I hoped for it and worked for it during the first week of their stay here. I did not despair of it during the intervening period when Zionists and non-Zionists and even former anti-Zionists, when friends of the organization and those who have heretofore held aloof from the organization, when members of this organization and members of a Fraction and members of the Canadian organization came down and endeavored to establish the enduring basis of peace.

I hoped for it during this past week when judicial duties took me away from the center of operations, New York, but still left me in Chicago within reach of the mails and the telegraph and the long distance telephone. You have read in the current prints, in the *New Palestine*, and in *The New Maccabean*, you have all read much of this controversy, and I do not propose reciting it again in full detail. But I will begin where they left off and I will begin with this week, for, as I say, I am unprepared, having hoped and hoped during this past week that the enduring basis of peace would be found.

And I hoped it particularly on Wednesday last when over the long distance telephone there was read to me what purported to be a draft of proposals from the last of the intermediaries; carefully framed, as it seemed to me, absolutely fair and just to all sides; at the conclusion of the reading I authorized the statement that I was ready to endorse and to sign such proposals. Of course, I claim no authority to bind this Convention or to bind the Executive Committee, but so far as I can speak, and I can certainly speak for myself, these proposals were entirely agreeable. On the next day came a telegram. It contained conditions. It contained the statement that subject to these conditions which I shall advert to later, all other differences could be obviated; those were the differences of principle on which we had expended so much time and so

much effort,—the differences of principle which in the document read to me the day before over the long distance telephone *had* been obviated.

The Keren Hayesod in the United States as a donation fund established by or under the auspices of the Zionist Organization of America—

Interruption—MR. SCHWEITZER: Never.

JUDGE MACK: If the gentleman means that he would never agree to that, he will be given an opportunity to express himself in the course of this Convention.

Interruption—MR. SCHWEITZER: I thank you.

JUDGE MACK: If the gentleman means that I never received the telegram and telephone that I have stated that I received, the gentleman is mistaken.

Fellow Zionists and members of the Zionist Organization of America, I am rendering to you a report of my stewardship; you may disapprove it in whole or in part. You may approve it in whole or in part. That is for you to say. It is my duty frankly, fully and completely to render you a report. (Applause and cheers.)

What were the conditions? That Dr. Weizmann be guaranteed at the Congress my and Brandeis' support and co-operation for complete re-organization of the World Executive, names to be considered by both in conference. The questions of principle can be obviated, this message stated.

Gentlemen, ladies, fellow Zionists, that was not a question of principle. I go back to an earlier date and will return later to this message. I go back to a historic date in the negotiation between your representatives of the Zionist Organization of America and our distinguished visitors representing the World Zionist Organization.

I go back to a Sunday morning, April 17th. The story has been told that, the evening before, at least so far as the President of the World Zionist Organization personally was concerned, the exclusive donation fund had been accepted. And on that night, the four secretaries, one representing the Zionist Organization of America, and one, two or three representing the World Zionist Organization, drafted a tentative agreement that had been reached. They did not draft it quite in the form in which it had been reached. They inserted certain preliminary phrases not theretofore agreed upon.

And Sunday morning after they had considered and drafted it all night they presented it, and together with others of your representatives I was considering the language and the form of these proposals.

A telephone message came. The agreement was rejected. That afternoon the proclamation was issued establishing in America the branch office of the Keren Hayesod, Ltd., of Great Britain. I was not present, being unable to occupy two entirely different places at the same moment. I have never been told by the sender of the message why it was rejected, why negotiations were abruptly cut off. Why? No endeavor was made to discuss any part of it in form or in substance further. I have had, however, a picture from one who was at the other end of the telephone and the picture is one of threats to break the man in Europe, to break the man in Palestine, to break the man in this country, if the tentative agreement theretofore accepted, tentatively accepted, should be actually accepted.

Principles or persons—what was the contest? Let me go back to last

winter, when Simon and De Lieme and Robert Szold, at the invitation of the World Executive, proceeded as the reorganization commission to Palestine. I was not present last summer in London, but I have talked with all the Americans, I think, who were there, and I think, having read the complete report of the proceedings, and the complete stenographic report of the meetings of the American delegation, and having had these personal talks and having listened to the personal reports made on their return to the Executive Committee, that I have a fair picture of what there took place.

A small executive was constituted to hold office until the Congress, a small executive of Weizmann and Sokolow, of course, of Simon and De Lieme, and of Ussischkin. Jabotinsky (applause), a fighter and a hero, a sufferer and a martyr, was rejected by the London conference as a member of the executive. The Jewish hero has his place on the battlefield and in the hearts of the Jewish people. But the Jewish people in congress assembled did not pick out the hero as a member of the executive. But when Simon and De Lieme were on the ocean, Jabotinsky came, and it did not take long before he went on the Keren Hayesod board, and it did not take very long before he went on the Executive, and it did not take very long before Simon and De Lieme went off the Executive board. (Applause.)

Interruption—DELEGATE: Good riddance.

JUDGE MACK: Good or bad is not the question. Good or bad is not the question of the Emek Yezreel land purchase.

Method, procedure, order, propriety, right, correctness, following all agreements and orders and mandates. That is the question. (Applause.)

In October the Keren Hayesod agreed to be under the control of the World Zionist Organization Executive, agreed that a member of that Executive should have a 51 per cent control vote. But Jabotinsky commanded that that condition be destroyed and the control vested elsewhere, as has been clearly pointed out.

Interruption—DELEGATE: Paid advertising.

JUDGE MACK: My friends, I won't go back further. I will go forward again to this week. In the telegram there was another condition, that de Haas be eliminated from office, except as he may be elected to the Executive Committee. (Applause and cheers.)

Interruption—DELEGATE: Wonderful. We have statesmen.

Interruption—DELEGATE: The quicker the better.

JUDGE MACK: That Frankfurter must not be even on the Executive.

DELEGATE: Good.

DELEGATE: Jewish hero.

JUDGE MACK: I rejected the proposals with these modifications. (Applause.) I stated over the phone, as I state to you, despite the applause, that I have worked many years in many capacities, official and non-official, with many men of all kinds and conditions, and many women, and that never in all my experience have I worked with a man who despite any and all faults—and which of us is free from faults?—is so downright energetically honest in act and thought as Jack de Haas. (Applause.) And I stated then over the phone that it seemed again to be a contest not about principles but about persons. (Applause.) The next day, yesterday, I received another draft. The draft contained no such conditions. The draft completely changed in substance and effect the

principles which had been laid down in the draft read over the phone to me on Wednesday, and which I had been willing to accept. But when the draft was presented to me yesterday, it was accompanied by a statement that the acceptance of any peace proposition rested upon the making of a verbal gentleman's agreement, eliminating de Haas and Frankfurter, and I rejected it for both reasons. (Applause.)

This morning—and I state to you that I hoped and hoped and hoped until this morning—this morning, at six o'clock, I was awakened by a telegram from the gentleman who has so earnestly and devoutly sought to act as intermediary during the past week; this was in answer to a telegram sent by me to him yesterday stating that I could not accept the so-called gentleman's agreement; he answered that there was no such condition, and at nine o'clock this morning the Hon. Nathan Straus, Jr., Senator of the State of New York, the worthy son of our great and worthy Vice-President, Nathan Straus (applause) stated to me that before leaving New York yesterday afternoon he had called up Mr. Abraham Tulin, than whom no man has stood closer to the leaders of the World Zionist Organization. (Applause.) He was again informed by Mr. Tulin, corroborating the telegram sent to me—you gentlemen who want to know who sent the telegram, I am stating this to you now—corroborating the telegram sent me by Mr. Rosensohn.

Interruption—DELEGATE: Who is he?

JUDGE MACK: I will tell you in a few minutes; stating that this was a condition precedent to the agreement. You asked me who Mr. Rosensohn is?

DELEGATE: Yes.

JUDGE MACK: You, who have read all the documents in the case and have taken occasion to criticise a number of them? Mr. Rosensohn is the gentleman whom the President of the World Zionist Organization requested me, in the week before the break, to bring with me as my secretary instead of the gentleman whom I had intended to bring with me as my secretary—

Interruption—DELEGATE: At whose suggestion?

JUDGE MACK: I don't care at whose suggestion, and I cast no slurs on anyone. I am reciting the facts as they came to me. I am not placing blame or responsibility, but you delegates have tried and hoped and prayed as I have for peace (applause), and it is my duty to tell you why at this moment there has been no peace despite our hopes and prayers. I have not read—I have not had the time to read all of the last number of the *New Maccabaeon*.

Interruption—Mr. FISHMAN: You missed a great deal.

JUDGE MACK: I have not been privileged as yet to read Mr. Neumann's lengthy and I have no doubt ably written document. (Applause.) I have noted in glancing that he reverts again to matters that he and I have had occasion to discuss in public, matters concerning your last convention. I shall not touch upon them again. The record is clear. I have given my word half a dozen times as a man, a Zionist, a lawyer and a judge, as to what that record means. Mr. Neumann is of a different opinion. I was struck, however, with one line in that article, and if I had not found it there I should not have referred to it. I mean now the question of principle, about which I intend to say a few words, the principle of so-called Diaspora nationalism. I have heard it said

yesterday and to-day that the majority in the Zionist Organization of America are not in favor of political Zionism, that they want a few colonies in Palestine, and nothing more. I cannot imagine from what speech, from what writing such misconceptions could have arisen. We are political Zionists. We believe in a Jewish nationality, and we believe that in the course of time Palestine will be the Jewish National Homeland in every respect. (Applause.) But, fellow Zionists, I read from the bottom of the first column of page 36: "The contention of Zionism since the beginning of the movement has been that the Jewish people, scattered and dispersed, are now, here, a living nationality." We all believe that. What does it mean? We defined it in the Executive Committee in February, 1920, when in answer to a series of questions from one of our members I drew up a full reply and laid it before the Executive Committee, and perhaps with one or two not voting (I withdraw the "perhaps" in view of the shake of the heads), with one or two not voting, that letter was adopted as the expression of the views of the Zionist Organization of America, and I was directed to send it and to publish it as such. This was done. I refer you to the records for the full statement. In substance it affirmed what I had been privileged to state as my personal views in a little pamphlet a few years before on Americanism and Zionism. I say, of course in all humility, that I was only expressing the common and practically unanimous view. It asserted as I now assert, that the Jews scattered throughout the world are a living nationality in the sense of a people with a common inheritance, a common tradition, and for the largest part a common religion. It asserted, as I now assert, that there is no political tie binding together the Jews of the world, but that politically the Jewish citizens of the United States are exclusively American citizens. (Great applause and cheers.)

It asserted, as I now assert, that the question of recognition of the Jews in any country as a separate and distinct group was a question to be decided in each of those countries, and that when in Paris we asked for national rights for the Jews in the new and enlarged states of Eastern Europe, we asked it for them as we asked it for every other national group in each of those countries because, as we then asserted, equality of treatment to which the Jew is entitled meant equality as an individual with all other individuals, and equality as a group or nationality with each other group or nationality within that country. But we asserted then, as we assert now, that in the United States of America, and in the countries of Western Europe, there are no group-nationality political rights, and we asserted and claimed none for the Jews in America, as no group in America asserted or claimed such rights for itself. We asserted then, as we assert now, that in Palestine the Jews, when the time came, would be the dominating element, would form a political nation in Palestine (applause), but that the thought of a political status of the Jews of the world was an impossible conception.

MR. LIPSKY: I arise to a point of order.

JUDGE MACK: Fellow Zionists, if what I have said—

MR. LIPSKY: I arise to a point of order.

JUDGE MACK: State your point of order.

MR. LIPSKY: My point of order, Mr. Chairman, is very simple, and it is as follows: On the agenda of this convention appears an item called a message from the President. A message from the President has

been circulated among the delegates containing a report of the administration for the year. This report the delegates have read. They assumed that this report was the report of the administration on its activities for the year. Now, at the very moment when the convention opens, the President introduces not the official report distributed to the delegates as the report of the Executive Committee, but enters into a discussion of theoretical questions, negotiations, personal observations, editorials in newspapers, remarks by individuals over the telephone, telegrams sent here and there, and he expects us to sit here and listen to an argument based on all this material. (Applause and cheers.)

JUDGE MACK: The Chairman rules the point of order not well taken. (Applause.)

Fellow Zionists, I say to you that if you approve of the principles that the Chairman has just stated to have been laid down by your Executive Committee a year and a half ago, you will manifest it at the proper time. If any of you disapprove of those principles, it will be in order to say so frankly and openly. In the meantime, I refrain from reading the balance of the sentence the first part of which I have just read. You have all had it. And I stated then that if that sentence had not appeared I should not have found it necessary to say what I have said. Fellow Zionists, we want no legalized political Ghetto here or in Palestine. (Applause.) We want a living, breathing Jewish Nation in Palestine and of Palestine. (Applause.)

And to what are all of our efforts directed? To build up in Palestine upon the foundations of solid rock, and not on quicksand, a Jewish civilization in the fullest sense of the word, not a cultural center alone, not a series of colonies alone, but a full pulsating Jewish life for the restored Jewish people in the Jewish National Homeland. (Applause.) I know that you are unanimous on that proposition. Minority and majority, in the World Organization and American Organization, and in every other Zionist Organization, the question is how shall it be done? The question is, shall it be done thoroughly, carefully, firmly, with a solid foundation on business principles (laughter)—call it, if you will, *Amerikanische-Holländische Geschaefit Zionismus*—but I say again, shall it be done on the sound bed rock of economic progress, driven by the spur of an intense Jewish national feeling, or shall it be done wastefully and slipshodly, in a hurry and bustle, without adequate safeguards?

Fellow Zionists, there is not one of us, no matter whether he works for this cause twenty-four hours a day, no matter whether he gives his maaser, his double maaser or triple maaser, or his whole fortune, who is doing the greatest work for the upbuilding of that land. (Applause and cheers.) The Chaluzim (applause and cheers), not my Chaluzim, not the World Leaders' Chaluzim, not your Chaluzim, but *our* Chaluzim, University men and women, working on the roads in Palestine, they are doing the foundation work honestly, soundly, fundamentally, for the great future of the Jewish people. Let us take that as our guide and our example in the economic and the financial and political work that we are to do. Let us go at it with the same zeal, the same devotion, but also the same fundamental correctness with which they are attacking their job, and how, how can we help them best?

My friends, there has been charge and countercharge levelled against many of us. We thought that Mr. Ussischkin had levelled a most serious

charge against us, but he manfully, publicly declared that we had misunderstood his words, and every one of us has frankly accepted his statement, because we know that whatever else we may think about Ussischkin he is a downright frank and honest man in every respect (applause and cheers), and I single him out because I am told that he is laboring under the impression that perhaps someone in our midst had thought of charging him or the Zionist Commission, of which he is the head, with certain things which nobody ever dreamed. I say that nobody, in word or speech, spoken or written so far as I know—and I think I know what has been said and written on this subject—has ever charged him or the Commission with these things.

Interruption—DELEGATE: Mrs. Sobel did it.

DELEGATE: Frankfurter did it.

DELEGATE: Brandeis did it in London.

Interruption—MR. PROMBOIN: Frankfurter said that in Boston.

JUDGE MACK: Never; I know better. I say he never said anything of the kind. The charges that have been made have been diversions from the budget to other budgetary purposes. The charges that have been made have been the use of trust funds for purposes, Zionist purposes—never any charge of bad intentions—always the charge that they were used for Zionist purposes, but wrongfully used, even though the intention was of the best, and even though the purposes were Zionistic, because the funds were not given for these purposes. These are the only charges that have ever been made in regard to these diversions of funds.

Friends, we can't build up Palestine even on the basis of honest intentions, combined with unbusinesslike action, and the *Geschaefits Zionismus*, of which I am proud to be an adherent, desires, as I trust everyone of you desire, that the foundation of the future Homeland shall be laid stout and strong, in accordance with the best and soundest principles. (Applause.) Unless that is done, your Chaluzim will suffer, and without these Chaluzim there will be no Jewish Homeland.

My friends, I have rendered to you in writing the account of the President's department up to a week or so ago. I regret the form that it had to take. I have rendered to you verbally today the necessary continuation of that report. I regret from the bottom of my heart the form that it had to take, but it is my duty to report facts and negotiations, and to leave the result in your hands. (Applause and cheers.)

JUDGE ROSENBLATT: May I, Mr. Chairman, at this time make certain corrections and amendments to your opening?

THE CHAIRMAN: Not at this time.

JUDGE ROSENBLATT: Very good.

MR. LIPSKY: On a point of procedure, Mr. Chairman. The Executive Committee, as I believe, refer this report through you to this convention?

JUDGE MACK: You are mistaken, Mr. Lipsky. The President has delivered, in accordance with the custom of the convention of this organization an address. The report will be laid before the convention when the convention is permanently organized. Again, in accordance with the practices of this convention, this opening session has heretofore been dedicated, as I had hoped it would be dedicated, today to the President's address and to addresses by the distinguished visitors.

MR. LIPSKY: Is it your intention to call upon the distinguished visitors now?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is. (Applause.)

JUDGE ROSENBLATT: As a point of information, or perhaps as a point of order—I will allow you to decide—would it not be proper, before we call on our distinguished visitors, to get all the facts of which, after all, only a part has been laid before the convention. I say it with the utmost respect for you, Mr. Chairman, because I believe you were unable to get all the facts, and I think that all the facts ought to be here before Dr. Weizmann appears.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that in accordance with the customs of this Organization a discussion at this time would be entirely out of order. The President, as in duty bound, has reported to the convention to the best of his own knowledge and belief. More than that he could not do. Less than that he could not do. Any discussions, any supplementary statements in connection with the things that the President has stated will come properly at another time, but not now. (Applause.) Fellow Zionists, it would be folly on my part to attempt to say anything in presenting the next speaker. I present to you the President of the World Zionist Organization, Dr. Chaim Weizmann.

The audience broke into thunderous applause, ending with the singing of the Hatikvah.

DR. WEIZMANN: Mr. President, fellow Zionists,

„אודיילה לאל אחלה פניו,
אשאלה בסנו מענה לשון“.

I will pray to the Lord to turn His countenance upon me: I will pray for words for my tongue. That would have been the fitting beginning at this hour. In deference to the statement of the President of this Organization, I shall not attempt now to correct some facts about which he is honestly misinformed. It will come up in proper course, and I am sure there are men in this hall who know the facts and will state them. I am sorry that conclusions have been drawn and submitted to this convention hastily. It does not befit the greatness of this hour to enter here upon discussions. I know full well the terrible responsibility which rests on this assembly, and I pray particularly for my friends. I have no right to address a request to my opponents to abstain from any manifestations even in favor of what is going to be said. We need all the wisdom and all the coolness we can master, and in the atmosphere of applause and heated discussion there is a probability that this wisdom will not be available. I therefore pray particularly for my friends to abstain from every manifestation. We are not here to score points over our opponents. We are here to get truth and to establish peace if it is possible. (Applause.)

Above all, what ever may be the merit of charges and countercharges, we are all anxious to get to work. The doors of Palestine are semi-closed and it is our fault if they are. We are increasing our fault daily and hourly. We have done so in the last hour. I shall, therefore, limit myself to a formal reply to the greetings which were given through your President to us. We appreciate them deeply and we are thankful to you. We Zionists are not here to pay each other compliments. It is not necessary. We are here to work and I pray that this meeting should set to work as

soon as possible. I am just as anxious for peace as anyone in this room, including the President. I am anxious for peace on a clear principle and on a clear constructive policy. I declare here solemnly that no person has ever entered my mind. I have nothing to do with personalities, including my own. If today, or in six weeks hence, the Congress will decide on another program, on other methods with which I cannot agree, I shall step down, without bitterness, and ready to serve the executive which the Congress will put in. (Applause.)

It is a matter of program, principle and work, full work, absolute. It is not to be considered as a sacrifice. It is a privilege, and this privilege is to be exercised, fully, wholly.

Ladies and gentlemen, I do not wish to detain you with trivial words of greeting, not being able at this moment to rectify this fact—I shall wait for the opportune moment and tell you fully what conditions have been proposed and why they have been rejected. But one thing you will permit me to state at the outset, which perhaps the President has forgotten to state. I don't know whether it was intended or whether it was in the heat of his speech, but he tried at least to convey the impression that principles are not at stake but persons. In the conditions which were formulated yesterday, there was one personal condition, namely, that I should undertake to recommend in good faith and with all the persuasion I am capable of bring to bear, that Judge Mack should be re-elected as President. I undertook to do it and I have a document to that effect in my pocket. So it was principles and persons on both sides. That is all I would like to say to you at this stage.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am at the end of a terrible trial which lasted for almost two months without interruption for a single minute. I would like to give you my conclusion. I am convinced that America, the American Zionist Organization, once set up and once organized and once having a clear program before its eyes—that this Organization alone, backed by the Jewry of America, by all the sympathies that are available and can be rendered available for Palestine, can build up Palestine within a short time. It is in your power. You have got the sympathies, you have got the enthusiasm, and you have got the money. You can do it and I hope and trust that out of this assemblage you will emerge stronger, with definite, clear principles, with courage and enthusiasm to begin the hard work. If I can in my limited resources contribute, I am ready to do my utmost. I thank you. (Great applause and cheers.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Before introducing the next speaker, may I say that the omission to state what Dr. Weizmann has stated was due neither to intention nor to forgetfulness nor to the heat of the address but was due to the absence of information. (Laughter and applause.)

The Chairman then introduced in succession Dr. Ussischkin, "the President of the Zionist Commission in Palestine, a member of the World Zionist Organization," Dr. Schmarya Levin, "one who has labored in the Zionist ranks for well-nigh fifteen years, better known than any other of the world leaders to every Jew in America," Dr. Mossinsohn, "the pioneer teacher in Palestine," and Mr. Naiditch, "one of the oldest in the Zionist ranks, one of the soundest leaders of the Keren Hayesod."

Drs. Ussischkin, Levin and Mossinsohn and Mr. Naiditch extended greetings to the Convention. Their remarks were greeted with tremendous applause.

THE CHAIRMAN: In accordance with our custom, a few words will now be said in memory of the Zionists who have died since the last convention and especially of the martyrs who have fallen in Jaffa, I shall ask Dr. Weizmann to say a few words.

The delegates rose and with bowed heads listened to Dr. Weizmann.

DR. WEIZMANN: Mr. President, fellow Zionists, it is the lot of all men to part at the appointed time. We do not in vain lament those who in the ordinary natural course must leave our midst. Such is their fate. But we will wait today for those pioneers, the Chaluzim, who died in the recent struggles in Jaffa and elsewhere. They sanctified our land with their blood. Perhaps, I am sure, it is a great thing to have died this death, to have made their names sacred in our memory and to remain as a shining example of Jewishness. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Two or three resolutions have been prepared which I believe will meet with unanimous approval. Before proceeding to the permanent organization of this convention and as I say in the belief that these resolutions will be unanimously accepted, permit me to read them:

"Reaffirming the profound conviction of American Jewry in behalf of the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, the twenty-fourth annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America earnestly and confidently calls upon the allied and associated powers and the council of the League of Nations speedily to confirm the mandate for Palestine to Great Britain, in conformity with the Balfour Declaration and the San Remo decision."

The resolution was unanimously adopted by a rising vote, the delegates applauding.

THE CHAIRMAN: "This twenty-fourth Annual Convention of the Zionist Organization of America reaffirms its abiding confidence in the policy of Great Britain regarding the Jewish National Homeland and expresses anew its faith in the devotion and statesmanship of Sir Herbert Samuel as High Commissioner for Palestine."

The resolution was unanimously adopted by a rising vote, the delegates applauding.

THE CHAIRMAN: "With profound regret and overwhelming sorrow, we have learned of the recent tragic occurrences in Jaffa, not only because lives were sacrificed and human beings maimed and wounded, but because we see in such incidents the danger of the growth of a division of sentiment amongst the inhabitants of Palestine, who should, whatever their origin or creed, by mutual forbearance, work together, as they must and should dwell together. While we respectfully urge that the government of Palestine take steps to prevent the recurrences of such excesses, while we favor keeping open the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigrants, we place on record our profound conviction that the development of Palestine as the Jewish Homeland can be and must be carried out in the spirit of goodwill, of friendship and brotherhood towards the other inhabitants of the land."

The resolution was unanimously adopted by a rising vote, the delegates applauding.

The Convention proceeded to the election of a Committee on Credentials and a Committee on Elections. The Chairman was informed that the Committee on Elections, acting in the capacity of a Committee on Credentials, had practically settled all relevant matters. The action of

this Committee was approved and the roll adopted, it being understood that any subsequent disputes which the Committee might not be able to agree on would be submitted to the Convention.

The Convention proceeded to the election of permanent officers of the Convention, and nominations for the Chairman were then in order.

DR. STEPHEN WISE: I move that the Honorable Julian W. Mack be elected permanent chairman of this convention, and I so nominate him (Applause).

The Chair was then vacated by Judge Mack and taken by Dr. Harry Friedenwald.

NATHAN STRAUS, JR.: Might I have the privilege and honor of seconding the nomination made by Dr. Wise?

MORRIS ROTHENBERG: This convention is to sit in review upon the course of action pursued by the present administration. So intense are the differences that have arisen among the Zionists of the country with respect to the acts and events that have transpired during the term of this administration that it is evident that the Zionists of the country have arrayed themselves in opposing groups. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that under this situation it would be very inappropriate for the chief officer of the present administration, whose acts are so closely related to those about to be reviewed by the convention, to conduct the proceedings of the convention. I desire to point out that excepting at the last convention in Buffalo, it has never been the custom for the official President of the Organization to act as the permanent chairman of the convention and our constitution specifically provides that the convention shall select its own officers. It is my privilege to nominate a gentleman whose acts will not be subject to discussion before this convention, one who has been far removed from the heat and dust of the conflict and who, by his judicial training and experience, is eminently fitted to conduct the convention. I have the honor to nominate Judge Henry J. Dannenbaum of Texas. (Applause.)

Rabbi Jurman rose to second the nomination of Judge Mack. A point of order by Mr. Fishman that this was no longer in order was not well taken by the Chairman. Rabbi Jurman, speaking in Yiddish, seconded the nomination of Judge Mack.

Mr. Abe Goldberg, speaking in Yiddish, then seconded the nomination of Judge Dannenbaum. He said that it is a rule of Jewish law that no man should sit in judgment or as arbiter of his own acts. He insisted that the friends of Judge Mack should not put him in an embarrassing position and that they themselves should second the nomination of Judge Dannenbaum.

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Wise has the floor.

DR. WISE: Mr. Chairman and fellow Zionists. I am not a humorist. I cannot make humorous speeches either in Yiddish or in English, but I know what truth and integrity mean, and to urge that Judge Mack be not elected chairman in order to render him the office of friendship may be a brilliant stroke of humor. After all, let us remember it may be true that Judge Mack is to be invited to sit in that chair and to preside over those proceedings in the course of which the actions and the conduct of the executive and the administration are to be judged, approved

or disapproved. I would like to hear one man arise in this room and say that Judge Mack is not capable of absolute fairness towards everyone here. (Applause and cheers.)

Dr. Wise was at this point subjected to considerable interruption on the part of the delegates, Mr. Lipsky rising to a point of order with regard to unparliamentary expressions on the part of interrupters. The Chairman finally restored order, requesting the delegates to moderate their expressions in stating their point. He then asked Dr. Wise to proceed.

DR. WISE: Mr. Chairman, I was about to say that I have a fault to find with the gentleman whom I had the distinction of nominating a moment ago. The trouble with Judge Mack, as far as there is any trouble with him, is that he is too fair, if such a thing can be, to those that disagree with him and that he always leans backward in the obviously scrupulous desire of his soul to do justice to all men. I nominate and urge the election of Judge Mack as the chairman, remembering as my dear friend, Mr. Rothenberg, cannot help remembering, that at some conventions we have chosen the President, though at some conventions we have chosen others to officiate as presiding officer. And I urge the election of Judge Mack for this additional and in my own judgment an unanswerable reason. There are great issues to come before the convention. If at this moment you drive Judge Mack out of the chair—

Dr. Wise was here subjected to further interruption, a delegate interjecting "No threats!"—

DR. WISE: Mr. Chairman, I could teach this young man parliamentary law. If you wish to serve notice upon American Zionists, if you wish to serve notice upon the Jewish people of America, the case was closed before the Convention began. But I ask you to listen to the evidence in the case. Is it your wish to say to Judge Mack and to those who have stood with him and will continue to stand with him "We have no confidence in your sense of standards?" I have nominated Judge Mack to the chair not only remembering his great, unforgettable services to the Zionist cause, but because no juster, fairer man lives in Israel, the world over. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rothenberg has the floor.

MR. ROTHENBERG: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, if there were anything necessary to further demonstrate that those whose acts are to be judged by this convention, are not those to conduct the proceedings of this convention, it was the statement of Dr. Wise and also the preliminary statement made today by Judge Mack. (Applause.) I would make no insinuation and not cast the slightest slur upon anyone who has rendered service to our movement. I feel that whatever any man has done for the upbuilding of Palestine should be appreciated, but fellow Zionists, this is not the time when we should distribute honors. This is the time so to arrange the procedure here that we shall be able to arrive at the truth. And I say that if Judge Mack is to be rendered honor for what he has done in the past, we will not show it by electing him Chairman of the convention, that he might judge his own acts, but at the proper time we shall express our appreciation of those things. (Applause.)

Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, I would call your attention to the intensity of feeling that has been roused in this controversy, and I

would recall here Mr. Justice Brandeis, in a decision which I had the privilege of quoting in our executive committee, is the authority for the statement that in a conflict which involves one's own feeling, no human being can be trusted to be impartial. (Applause.) This is not a question of justice to Judge Mack. It is a question of having one in the chair whose acts are not under discussion. We shall find an opportunity of expressing in the future our appreciation of the service of Judge Mack to our movement in the past.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a question of principle, and not a question of honors, and let us show ourselves worthy of this situation by recording the principle that is involved in this motion.

MR. LIPSKY: I move the question.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question has been called for. All in favor of the question will please say Aye. All opposed say No. The Ayes have it.

On motion from Mr. Lipsky, the Chairman called for a roll call of the delegates, and appointed Messrs. Kallen and Robison a committee of tellers. The votes were cast amidst the greatest excitement. The Chairman then announced the result: for Judge Mack, 75; for Judge Dannenbaum, 139. The result was received with loud applause.

THE CHAIRMAN: It devolves upon Judge Dannenbaum to come upon the platform. I have the honor to present Judge Dannenbaum as the permanent chairman of this convention.

The Chair was taken by Judge Dannenbaum.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I do not thank you for this honor. I accept it as a service, however humble. It is a call that lies close to my heart and I would not have this or any other position of honor or responsibility either did I not feel that thereby I might promote, be it only to the extent of the fraction of an inch, the establishment of a Jewish Homeland in Palestine. (Applause.)

This convention has no time for a personality or for personalities. Living remote from the center of American Jewish life, I had hoped it would be possible to maintain until the last moment an attitude of absolute impartiality and such shall be my course as the chairman of this convention. But the humblest shall have no more right than the mightiest and the mightiest shall have none less than the humblest and above all things there will be no respect for persons as such. I would fain stop here and permit the adjournment which I know you desire and to which you are entitled, but it becomes necessary for me as the chairman of this convention to remove certain impressions created by Judge Mack which are now being flashed over the wires over all America and will tomorrow appear in the daily papers. It is necessary to remove those impressions, to correct or qualify those statements, and as your mouthpiece I am going to do it.

Now, at the ending of this day, all Jewry is hoping that the Zionists of America will have found peace, so that the mighty fund which we are undertaking to raise, may be raised speedily and successfully and the work of rehabilitation begun.

But Judge Mack is not alone in his desire for peace. There have been cravings for peace in the heart of everyone connected with the controversy. At the beginning of the proceedings I would like to say that in my humble way, and to the extent of my feeble influence I attempted to get peace.

The Chairman then outlined to the Convention the history of his efforts to obtain a peace in the Zionist organization, reading a number of telegrams which had passed between Judge Mack and himself with regard to his offer to act as intermediary in the establishment of peace.

The Chairman was subjected to considerable interruption by delegates who submitted that his account of these negotiations were not then in order.

MR. LIPSKY: We have been sitting here from half-past two until now, half past six. Most of us are irritated and I believe the address of the Chairman, which is in order, could properly come at the opening session tonight. I therefore move to adjourn.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not my desire to inconvenience you or inflict myself upon you. If you are in favor of adjourning, I shall put the motion. All those in favor say Aye. All those opposed, No.

The vote being taken, the first session adjourned at Six-thirty P. M., and the Chairman set the hour of Eight-thirty for the second session.

SECOND SESSION

HELD AT HOTEL CLEVELAND, CLEVELAND, ON SUNDAY, JUNE 5TH.

The second session was called to order by Judge Henry J. Dannenbaum at 9:00 P. M.

On motion from Mr. Lipsky Dr. S. M. Melamed and Messrs. B. G. Richards and M. W. Weisgal were elected secretaries to the Convention.

Mr. Lipsky called the attention of the Convention to the lack of adequate press facilities, and proposed that there be elected a Committee on Press. Owing to the difficulty of obtaining delegates to serve on this Committee, Mr. Lipsky subsequently withdrew the motion.

On question from the Chairman as to what further business there lay before the Convention, Mr. Lipsky, expressing regret that he should be forced to take the floor so frequently on questions of procedure, pointed out that the administration should have been present at the session to present the business of the Convention. In its absence he submitted that at the time of the last adjournment the business before the Convention was presumably the submission of a report or address by the President, to be followed by the report of the Executive Committee.

The Chairman informed the Convention that Judge Mack, then attending some conference, would shortly arrive, and suggested that the interval, if not too long, could be filled by the reading of greetings and other communications to the Convention, which was done.

Judge Mack having arrived during the reading, the business of the Convention was resumed.

The Chairman then called upon Rabbi Glazer of Kansas City to come to the platform and address the Convention.

RABBI GLAZER: Mr. Chairman, and fellow delegates, I highly appreciate the honor that has been accorded me and I deem it a privilege to be able to speak to you a few minutes and to reveal to you the thoughts that came into my mind this afternoon when I saw our great leader sitting on this platform and listening to what has been said.

Fellow delegates, I know that there are differences and I give voice to my sentiments that insofar as the Keren Hayesod is concerned, I am with you heart and soul. I believe that we must have a common fund to finance the establishment of a National Home Land in Palestine. I also believe that now is not the time to count pennies and cents and dollars. Now is the time to give precious lives and save them. Now is not the time to take to task our great leaders when confronted by the enemy, and our enemy we have from within and without. We do not have to go very far to find the enemies of Israel.

I have served for the past twenty-five years the most humble of the American-Jewish people. I appeal to you now in the name of all Rabbis in America, who trust that at this Convention we shall not lose a single member of the Zionist Organization of America. Let us see if we cannot establish harmony.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Convention is ready for the transaction of business. The Convention is ready to receive the report of its officers.

JUDGE MACK: Mr. Chairman, I present herewith to you as Chairman and to the delegates of the Twenty-fourth Annual Convention the report of the President's department, together with the annual report of the Executive Committee, a report of the Palestine Department, the report of the Medical Unit, the report of the *New Palestine*, the report of the Department of Organization, and probably I should present, as it is in the same volume, the report of the Hadassah Bureau.

DR. WISE: I move you the adoption of the report as presented by the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization of America.

THE CHAIRMAN: It has been moved and seconded that this Convention adopt the report of the President as that of the Zionist Organization of America. You have heard the question. Is there any discussion?

MR. RICHARDS: I desire to offer this amendment: That the report presented here, which I presume has been distributed, be received and placed for discussion before the delegates.

DELEGATE: Seconded.

DR. WISE: I rise to a question. Does not my resolution say just that, that the report is being presented, it is now before us for discussion; it remains before us under discussion as long as my resolution is before the House, namely, that it be adopted. A vote on adoption will not and cannot be taken excepting after discussion, unless the House unanimously waives its privilege of discussion. I believe my resolution is in order.

THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is for the Convention to adopt the report.

MR. RICHARDS: I withdraw my amendment.

JUDGE ROSENBLATT: Mr. Chairman, and fellow delegates, we have had a long rest and I trust that emotions that swayed us a few hours ago have been dispelled, that we now can talk freely and calmly on the facts. I want to apologize for any bitterness that I personally might have caused in the heat and temper of the debate this afternoon. Expressions might have been uttered, the framing of which might have been more fortunate, and I am sure both sides are willing to forget and forgive. (Applause.)

DR. WISE: (In Hebrew) I forgive you as you have spoken.

JUDGE ROSENBLATT: I am particularly happy over the Hebrew quotations from Rabbi Wise whom I respect in spite of some phrases that might have passed in the debate this afternoon. Now I want to bring out certain facts which the President this afternoon did not bring before the Convention—and I again say that I do this without the slightest thought of reflection on the President. I had the misfortune during the last few months to be one of the so-called peace negotiators and it was I who was the bearer of that heavy message over the telephone which has been mentioned by the President—the message that the proposition had been rejected. But it is hardly fair, ladies and gentlemen, to give you that one sentence and not to give you the facts that preceded the whole controversy. That Saturday afternoon, I was with Dr. Weizmann and at his suggestion I went into conference. It is immaterial who the other names are but Mr. Rosensohn was there, a man whom I honor and respect. We stayed up nearly all night trying to get a formula. It was

specifically understood that when we went into the conference that he did not represent Judge Mack, that I did not represent Dr. Weizmann. We were simply two individuals, although perhaps sent by the parties, trying, groping for some formula of peace—and it was understood that we were binding no one, that we were to come back, I to Dr. Weizmann, he to Judge Mack and then to submit this thing, this tentative thing that we had drafted and see whether or not it would be accepted. I had my doubts as to its acceptance from the very beginning, because the very first clause was highly objectionable to me. I swallowed it. I did not gracefully accept it. I said, "I will do my best to try to get Dr. Weizmann to accept it," but it was definitely understood that this was not the proposition of both parties, but a proposition of an outside arbitration board presenting a possible peace formula. What happened? I came back. I will not say what some of my comrades said about me, because the task of the peacemaker lies along a very thorny path, but they rejected particularly the first proposition which gave the Zionist Organization of America as they thought—I don't say that we represented it as such—control over the Keren Hayesod. It then became my heavy duty to telephone it to Mr. Rosensohn.

Now if we had wanted to play politics we might have sat back and gotten a rejection from the other side. Dr. Weizmann said: "No, this is a matter of principle. I am going to telephone them that I cannot accept this draft." I said, "Rather than you I had better telephone myself." I telephoned. Mr. Rosensohn answered on the other side of the wire, and I will give you the exact words because I understood they were taken down by a stenographer on the other side and I received a copy afterwards.

"Hello, Sam, how are you? I am the bearer of a heavy message."
"What has been done?" he asked.

I used one word in reply, "Rejected." He then dropped the wire and I dropped the wire. Afterwards Dr. Weizmann confirmed it. No counter-offer or proposition was made. I am not suggesting here who was right or wrong. I want to once and for all present the facts that Dr. Weizmann did not go back on any agreement because there was no agreement. It was a submitted document to become an agreement when Dr. Weizmann accepted it. It was never accepted. We then went on, negotiation after negotiation. We will omit many efforts of peace until we come to the very last week. I think it was on a Wednesday, probably the Wednesday to which our honored president referred, that I received a telephone message—I think I have a right to mention it now—from Mr. Samuel Untermyer who tried to act as the peacemaker. Dr. Weizmann was in Washington and Mr. Untermyer said to me over the wire, "Is there any possibility for peace?" I said, "I hope so. Perhaps we can get peace, but I would like to see Dr. Weizmann." Dr. Weizmann came on Thursday. We saw Mr. Untermyer on Thursday and we talked about peace again.

And a draft was drawn up on Friday, two days ago. I left for the Convention in the hope that this draft might be accepted. Last night, Mr. Rosensohn told me, "I am sorry we cannot put this agreement through, for three reasons. One, because this draft does not make any distinction between donations and investments." I said, "You know, that is not insuperable. We had conceded it. These draftsmen had not thought about it. We can arrange about that point." He said, "That is not the

only thing. The second thing is that it means by some kind of an agreement the elimination of de Haas and Frankfurter and Ben Cohen."

(Interruption, delegate): Who said that?

JUDGE ROSENBLATT: Mr. Rosensohn, last night. In referring to these names, I do not want to use them, because in spite of the difference of opinion we have, I personally have a real affection for de Haas. I have been his comrade for years. In spite of differences with Frankfurter, I will never forget the service he rendered in Paris at a critical moment. (Applause.) And insofar—

(Interruption, MR. ROSENDOHN): Did I say it means the elimination or did Dr. Weizmann insist on a condition of elimination? There was a condition precedent.

JUDGE ROSENBLATT: I admit it. It was no intention to misrepresent, but meant that Dr. Weizmann insisted upon the elimination. This is what Mr. Rosensohn told me. Wait, you will get all the facts. I stopped before the name of Ben Cohen. I don't want to be throwing bouquets, for we are in the heat of a debate, but I think we can afford to be generous for services rendered. For two and one half years Ben Cohen was in London. I know he worked night and day for the Zionist cause because I saw him work. I respect him although I differ from him in many important things. The elimination of these three men as far as I know about it—and I don't think Mr. Rosensohn knows anything more beyond that—is based on the following fact: On Wednesday, two days before the drawing up of the draft, Mr. Tulin, in his office turned to Mr. Rosensohn in my presence, and said, "Well, you know you cannot separate principles from men. There are certain people that must be eliminated." These are the words of Abraham Tulin, not the words of Dr. Weizmann.

(Interruption, MR. ROSENDOHN): He stated that as coming from Dr. Weizmann.

JUDGE ROSENBLATT: I don't recall it. I don't doubt it if Mr. Rosensohn tells me that. He then said to Mr. Rosensohn, "You better telegraph that to Judge Mack in Chicago" and I suppose that Mr. Rosensohn telegraphed that to Chicago. That was the telegram I presume to which Judge Mack referred. Now in this case, because it has been made a case, where there is an effort to indict the president of the World's Zionist Organization of an untruth, we have got to have complete evidence, not mere suppositions.

I have been with Dr. Weizmann day in and day out, probably more than any other single individual except his comrades from Europe. At no time did he say to me that de Haas ought to be eliminated, that Frankfurter ought to be eliminated (although he resented certain things that Frankfurter said at a certain meeting in New York), or that Ben Cohen should be eliminated. At no time did he say that to me. The presumption is that he said it to Abraham Tulin and it may have been a condition.

I wish we had Mr. Tulin here to testify to those facts, but before and until we have them before us we have no right to convict the president of the World Zion Organization of uttering an untruth. (Applause.) Mr. Rosensohn is too good a lawyer not to know that you ought not to use secondary evidence before you try out your primary evidence by getting Abraham Tulin to come from New York. He can come here in thirteen hours.

Proceeding further, my own impression of that conference was that

Abraham Tulin believed that with the elimination of these three personalities, peace could be made. That is all I carried away from Mr. Tulin's room at that time of the conference and that Dr. Weizmann had not placed that as a condition *sine qua non*.

I saw Dr. Weizmann on Thursday and on Friday, when the draft was being prepared, in the room of Samuel Untermyer, 120 Broadway. Abraham Tulin telegraphed in my presence to Samuel Rosensohn, generally repeating those things, without the request of any one of us, merely as though he thought that peace could be made easier by such a condition. As long as we are getting the truth, ladies and gentlemen, in Heaven's name, let us get the whole truth.

Abraham Tulin also said this: "You know that this is a matter of personalities. I will undertake to convince Dr. Weizmann that he must insist on the re-election of Judge Julian W. Mack," and in the office of Samuel Untermyer that fact was put to Dr. Weizmann and he said, "I have no feeling against Judge Mack. He is the one man"—and I think I have a right to quote him,—"he is the one man I am willing to go out of my way for, but this is an American Convention. Have I the right to insist that they must elect a particular individual? Mr. Untermyer, I can only promise you this: that if peace is effected, I shall go to the Convention pledged to work hard for the re-election of Judge Julian W. Mack. Beyond that I cannot take the responsibility, because I do not know the feelings that have been engendered in this fight." That Mr. Untermyer accepted, telephoned it to Nathan Straus, Jr., in my presence and I understood that this was acceptable, although I naturally did not hear the reply over the wire.

Now, what are the facts? When I left New York and I came here, in spite of the fact that I had to wrangle with the extremists, I said we were going to have peace and I came to a convention where I knew I might be sacrificed personally if peace would be secured. And I thought so until last night when Mr. Rosensohn gave me three grounds on which it would be rejected and what is the third ground?

Assuming that donation and investment and the question of personalities would be solved here—the third ground was that under this agreement, nothing is left for the Zionist Organization of America, because all the great work is in the Keren Hayesod. Therefore we cannot accept. Now what is the implication (laughter) but that the Zionist Organization of America must either control or jointly control the Keren Hayesod?

Now we touch the matter of principle, which I must discuss in a few minutes before I close. We have heard a great deal about the principles of federalism, and I think I have a right to quote the memorandum to which I very strenuously objected, but which, over my objections, obtained the vote of the Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization of America.

We were told that we wanted a Federalist system. Now I say that when a man puts on the stand his witness, he must abide, under our legal rules, by the testimony of that witness. The administration has put on the witness stand this theory of Federalism. They have invoked the spirit of Abraham Lincoln. Let us see what Lincoln would have said. Does Federalism mean joint control? Does it mean that if President Harding needs money to run the United States, he sends a note or wire to Governor Miller of the State of New York, saying, "Please let me have

a million dollars?" Does he say that? If he did that he would have to send another telegram to the Governor of the State of Ohio and a few other Governors in the country. However, he does not do anything of the kind. He sends in the Collector of Internal Revenue and collects the money for the Federal Government; and Dr. Weizmann, needing the money as badly as any president ever needed it, for the Chaluзим for whom we are working, sends in the collectors of the Internal Revenue (and he has a right to get them not merely from America but from Palestine or London) to America to collect money for the central fund for the Federalist Government, the World Zionist Organization. (Applause.) Let me revert for one moment again to this theory of Federalism, which was a doctrine born of four years of civil war. It is a defined doctrine. There are Supreme Court decisions as to what Federalism means, and Federalism goes further than the question of money, because when the states withdrew from the Union and Abraham Lincoln learned that in the western part of the State of Virginia there were certain people in support of the Federal Government, he sent in the military power, split up the state of Virginia, erected the state of West Virginia, loyal to the Union, loyal to the Federal Government.

Now, I am not suggesting that Dr. Weizmann or his friends are going to do anything of the kind. I am merely suggesting that if this Convention should—and I speak only for myself now, and not for my comrades—I say that if this Convention were to say we have nothing to do with the Keren Hayesod, with this Central Fund, I would say that that resolution has no binding force upon me whatsoever. This is a Central Fund and my allegiance is to the World Zionist Organization. (Applause and cheers.) And that in such a contingency we have very important historical events that have defined for us, in the pages of American history, what Federalism means.

General Robert E. Lee, when the State of Virginia tore away from the Union, although he was personally opposed to slavery, said, "I must follow my state," and he went with his state. In spite of his great name and great achievements, history gave the verdict that the great Robert E. Lee was a rebel. Another man, another citizen of the State of Virginia, Farragut, not as learned as Lee, but grasping the great moral principle involved when the State of Virginia seceded, said, "My highest allegiance is to the Government of the United States. I refuse to follow the State of Virginia." And he became the great Admiral that helped to conquer the seceded states and bring us to victory in the Civil War. Now I say that history stands by Farragut and not by Lee in the definition of Federalism.

But there is another principle. The first principle announced in the memorandum—and the memorandum is on trial before us, because, as far as I see, that is the one great accomplishment of the outgoing administration. That first principle announced is the principle of Diaspora Nationalism. God only knows what it means. Since it is not defined, we have a right to define it. Diaspora Nationalism, I thought, was the same thing about which our honorary president wrote in a very famous essay when he first came into the Zionist ranks and which he calls the theory of nationality, not only the nationality for Palestine, but the theory of Jewish nationality. Will someone please define the difference between this theory of nationality and this great terrible danger of Diaspora Nationalism. Our honored president in one of the greatest speeches I ever

listened to, when he entered the Zionist ranks in the City of Boston in 1915, delivered a most eloquent plea on Jewish nationalism and in a very fine way repudiated his own testimony before the Immigration Commission in 1904, when he answered certain questions of Senator Lodge. I think he put it in a splendid fashion, but it seems to me that the testimony as stated was in effect Diaspora Nationalism. But we hear that there is a terrible danger to which Diaspora Nationalism is attached—*Gegenswartarbeit*.

I do not even know the phrase. Personally I do not care about Diaspora Nationalism. I know that I am in a woeful minority in this convention. I am so interested in Palestine that I have no time to argue with people about Nationalism and Diaspora Nationalism and other things. (Applause.) But how should our organization stand on *Gegenswartarbeit*? Why, if there was ever an example of a concerted force, wonderfully applied, with great extraordinary results, for *Gegenswartarbeit*, it was the tremendous force of the Zionist Organization from 1915 up to 1918. That *Gegenswartarbeit* is the Jewish Congress. In 1915, and I refer to this only in order to bring out all the points, Dr. Magnes was defeated in Boston because he insisted that our work should be only work for Palestine. I opposed him then because I felt that our politics demanded it—I am in a position to state that in Zionism we have great politicians.

In 1916, in the Philadelphia Convention, by an overwhelming vote and by the strong pressure of our Honorary President, we went in head over heels into the American Jewish Congress. Why did we go in? Not merely as participants, but in order to control it; so well did we work out our political game, not for ourselves, you understand, but for the great cause, that in 1917 we defeated, because politics demanded it, a great Jew to lead the Congress movement in the city of New York. By a scant few votes we defeated Louis Marshall, and elected Adolph Kraus, every Zionist voting, practically without a break in the ranks, for Adolph Kraus, because we thought that our political cause demanded an open and public repudiation and defeat of one of the greatest Jews in America.

That was *Gegenswartarbeit*.

I voted against *Gegenswartarbeit* in London, and I will vote against it to-day, because I want to concentrate all the energy for Palestine, and I recognized the day when we went into the Congress movement that it was only a temporary thing, a temporary political expedient as far as I was concerned.

But may I say one further word. This picture of Diaspora Nationalism—is this terrible doctrine imported from Russia and Palestine? Why don't you pick up the *Judenstadt*? I will point to phrases and words in the *Judenstadt* where the founder of Zionism talks about mass immigration, about going into communities and capturing Jewish communities, where he talks about organization of Jews, very similar to what the Keren Hayesod is trying to do today. One of the most surprising things to me in this struggle in which we are engaged is to see the old secretary of Theodor Herzl trying to convince me and others that the Diaspora Nationalism is a new doctrine and not the doctrine of Theodor Herzl. The political part, which we fear so much today, was the product of Theodor Herzl.

But another fundamental principle involved in that memorandum

was the manner of its presentation. For ten consecutive years I have been a member of the Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization, and in the first four years bore with three other comrades, Abel, Lipsky and Goldberg, the brunt of Zionist work when Zionist work was unpopular. I have at least earned the right, when a fundamental principle of Zionism is presented, to be able to sit and study and consider it. I received that memorandum at 2:30 in the afternoon and at 8:30 was asked to vote on what seemed to me a repudiation of Herzlian Zionism.

In a fight that lasted all evening, and until the vote was forced eleven o'clock Sunday morning, we were given no leeway. Why this hurry? Dr. Weizmann was coming in a week: could we not sit down like brothers and have it out with him? No, logic and power demanded that Dr. Weizmann be met in the United States with a firm stand for the Zionist Organization.

We had made up our minds to be suspicious of Dr. Weizmann, to be suspicious of his comrades, and the vote was taken not really on the affirmative side of a proposition, but on the negative. We were to protect ourselves by this new Talmud of the memorandum from Dr. Weizmann's oratory and persuasive powers. Now, friends, that dates back to a suspicion since London. Personally I was convinced in London that we were riding for a division in Zionism. I personally tried to heal that division, by letters that I can still produce, pleading with our leaders, because I knew we were riding for an inevitable fall in American Zionism. We were ignored.

I saw it coming in September, in October and November. When I was on my way to Palestine, I was called back to London. For what purpose? That I and Mr. Bernard Flexner should go back to the United States and build up the land bank. Well, we are still organizing it. I suppose the Keren Hayesod will have enough money to establish a land bank, but we debated, we suspected, we did nothing.

(Interruption: Delegate): Safeguards!

JUDGE ROSENBLATT: That came later. I was in doubt, and I might have been a doubting Thomas until the date of the memorandum, but when I saw that memorandum, I ceased to doubt. I knew where I stood. I knew that the cleavage had come, and if peace was coming (God knows I worked for it), if peace is coming, it must come on the basis of principle, and not on a surrender of principle. I dismissed the memorandum; and I want to conclude with only one other thought.

There has been a great deal of criticism of the Zionist Commission. I was one of the first to criticize the Zionist Commission. I am on record as a great critic of the Zionist Commission. I want to say that we American Zionists did not discover this method of criticism about Palestine. In 1894, I think it was, Alad-Haam, a pure cultural Zionist, who is not in very good graces these days, came back from Palestine with an indictment against the work in Palestine. That beats even the report of the reorganization committee. So we have not even a monopoly of the criticism, and it is not a new discovery that Palestine is not managed as well as the United States Steel Corporation. (Laughter.)

I have been twice in Palestine, and I tried to do, with a great many others, a piece of Palestine work.

Now may I say this? There is one piece of work in Palestine of which we are all proud, I as much as anyone else, and that is the work

of the Medical Unit. We accomplished a wonderful piece of work, but if you think the Medical Unit was free from incompetence, go to Palestine. I talked with the head of the Medical Unit. I know what they had to contend with. I know what the officers of our organization said about the work even of the Medical Unit, of which I am proud, of which we are all proud.

What does that mean? It means that a new civilization is being born in Palestine, that we have suffered and are straining for something better and under enormous difficulties, that the mere entrance of a single American does not wipe out these difficulties, and perhaps the best evidence is that of the Zionist Commission itself. Why should we blame it all on the poor head of Ussischkin? He was there fifteen months. We had four Americans on the Zionist Commission in Palestine, men whom I respect and honor and revere, and yet the fact seems to be, I will take the official figures, and I hope they are correct, that two-thirds of the money spent in Palestine has been spent by the Zionist Commission before Ussischkin ever got there. (Applause.) Spent, a good deal of it under the supervision of our former President of the American Zionist Federation, whose integrity and ability no one doubts, spent under the direction of the ex-treasurer of the Provisional Zionist Committee, spent under an expert whom we sent to Palestine, an able man whom I personally like; spent under the direction of a man who was so fit that the Joint Distribution Committee came in and took him away from us. Why should we build our cases on the faults of others? We went in and in brotherly fashion tried to remedy the conditions, to build up something better and finer. We are constantly aware of the five thousand miles of ocean that separates us from Palestine instead of referring to the soil that bind us together.

Now it seems to me, my friends, that peace can and will be established. Peace must be established. Peace can be established. On what basis? On the basis of the supremacy of the World Zionist Organization (applause), on the recognition of one great central fund which we shall call, of course, the Keren Hayesod? (Applause.) If for no other reason, because it has built up a great deal of good will that it would be a shame to lose now, but without infringing, and that is the thought I want to convey to you, without infringing on the rights of the Zionist Organization of America, of the Zionist Organization of Germany, to organize corporations, to induce individuals to go to Palestine, organizing new undertakings in and for Palestine, provided we have this one central fund. We used to think way back in 1918 that the Pittsburgh program prevented individuals from going to Palestine to make money. That part of the Pittsburgh program, which was really never a part of it, has, of course, no application today, and everybody knows it. If there are any millionaires in this hall, let them go to Palestine. Build up any industry you please. If there are here men, poor men, who think they can make a living in Palestine, of course, go; but over and above that individual enterprise, there must be one great, strong central fund, not only for the immigrant, but to build up this national interest in Palestine, without which we are lost. We are a minority of one-seventh, and in any distribution of benefits and advantages, we get one-seventh of the whole. Our important work is to build up a reserve fund, a man power, to re-

create this one-seventh, so that it becomes at least four-sevenths. (Applause.)

I only want to conclude how all this misunderstanding can be wiped away if we make up our mind to go to this problem without suspicion, but with the brotherly love engendered by the cause we have at heart. I will show you how far this suspicion is carried—no one debated the statutes of the Keren Hayesod. Do you know the real fundamental reason for the opposition to the statutes of the Keren Hayesod. It is not a secret. It is because the American Zionist leaders have no faith, no belief in the honesty of Jabotinsky, Slatopolsky, and the other men who are the first five directors. I organized the American Zion Commonwealth, and you know how I organized it? I telephoned to my friends, and we sat in our office, and we constituted the American Zion Commonwealth. If I were a smart fellow I would have put the certificate of incorporation in my pocket and would have owned it since that time. But being a Zionist, and not so clever, I decided to let other people in on this world scheme, and so five thousand people are in the American Zion Commonwealth at the present time. Now, I really believe that if there were fundamental faith in Jabotinsky and Weizmann, no one would have raised the issues that have been raised about statutes any more than has been raised about the Jewish Colonial Trust or other corporations. If we can simply wipe out the last few months of controversy and bitterness, and make up our minds that Weizmann is really a brother of Judge Mack in a great movement, if we make up our minds that Slatopolsky is not the wonderful speculator who is making millions out of Palestine (I can give him better fields for investment), and if we can make up our minds that he is honest, we can sit down, and if you want the amendments, have them, but instead of advertising in the press, come to us and say, "This is a better charter," and we will accept it. Was any effort made along that line? No, because suspicion was engendered. The first challenge I made was, "Let us cable to Jabotinsky, to this terrible man, who is determined to become the pirate of the Jewish people, and say, 'What would you think of adding besides the five, Dr. Wise, Mr. Rosensohn, even Professor Kallen, until there be six American directors, so that we would have eleven?' We would have eleven directors instead of five, and the Americans would have a representation of six directors, giving Americans the majority."

No, it was a much better argument to advertise in the Yiddish papers. You can wipe this out and sit down around the counsel table and we will get together. We will not debate nationalism. Since the San Remo decision there is no defense for a Zionist who wants a definition of Jewish nationalism. I am interested in one thing only, how much money, how much man power, can we assemble for building up the old land of Israel. (Applause and cheers.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Judge Mack has the floor.

JUDGE MACK: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege. Some hours ago, when Mr. Rosenblatt began, he said he was going to correct some of the things I had said, and was going to supply some of the missing features.

On this question of personal privilege, I do not propose at this time to discuss any of the second part of his remarks. I rise now solely to discuss two matters as to which Mr. Rosenblatt purported to correct me, the occurrences just preceding and on the morning of the break, April

17th, and the occurrences of the last few days. I speak on this question now, because what Judge Rosenblatt has said is a part of the record, and a more confused and incorrect picture of those occurrences could not well have been given.

I dare say, I don't think Judge Rosenblatt intended to give any incorrect representation of the occurrences, but his memory unfortunately is completely at fault, and the events of those days have been stamped indelibly upon my memory. He began with Saturday, he said afternoon; he meant night. He meant about nine o'clock Saturday night, April 16th. I start a few days earlier, or I come back to a few days earlier, after correcting the statement as to the events of that night and the following morning. He said that there was no agreement. I so stated this afternoon. I used the words this afternoon as I have used them in print, tentative agreement arrived at between Dr. Weizmann, not his colleagues, and myself. He said that the first paragraph, the opening paragraph, was surprising to him; that he was acting and the others were acting as arbitrators or intermediaries, a completely erroneous picture.

On the Wednesday night preceding, Dr. Weizmann having returned from Washington the day before, the meeting at the Metropolitan Opera House and the negotiations for four days having taken place in the preceding week, on Wednesday night, I met Dr. Weizmann, and I had with me, as I stated to you, and as I have stated in print, his secretary, the gentleman suggested to me by Dr. Weizmann to be my secretary. I have no doubt, as was interjected this afternoon by, I think, Judge Rosenblatt, the suggestion doubtless came to Dr. Weizmann from Mr. Tulin. I don't know. Dr. Weizmann's secretary was present. There were four of us. We discussed the matters that night, and the next morning Mr. Rosensohn and I prepared a draft of the things that we believed had been thrashed out the night before. A draft was also prepared on behalf of Dr. Weizmann, and we came together again, the four of us, on Thursday night, and the session lasted until midnight. I go into these details for the sake of history and for the sake of accuracy and for the purpose of giving you and preserving for the record the complete picture to take the place of the distorted picture presented to you this evening.

We thrashed out the first paragraph for an hour. Let me correct myself. There was presented that morning of the preceding day a draft, on behalf of Dr. Weizmann, and we prepared a different draft, and we discussed the two of them on Thursday night.

The first paragraph, as to which Judge Rosenblatt says is so surprising to him, was thrashed out for an hour, and it was pointed out why the one presented on behalf of Dr. Weizmann was not acceptable, and why the one that I had offered was the proper one, and the discussion ended, as I understood, in acquiescence.

(Interruption—DELEGATE): In whose acquiescence?

JUDGE MACK: In acquiescence on the part of Dr. Weizmann to the one that I had presented. Dr. Weizmann suggested, however, that night, that the elaboration of the matter of safeguards and publicity, et cetera, which in the draft as presented by me were all in one word, should be considered thereafter, and he further presented another question that had not theretofore been discussed. I took this matter, as I stated to him I would, under consideration, and on Friday night, late Friday afternoon,

I telephoned to his secretary that those things would make no trouble between us.

Thereupon it was decided that those things and the entire document containing these two points, as well as other points, that so far as I know had been fully discussed and completely acquiesced in on Thursday night, should be drawn up by the two secretaries. They came back on Saturday for the purpose of discussing them, and when Dr. Weizmann then stated not that the first paragraph was unacceptable but that the second paragraph, the donation fund exclusive was unacceptable, Mr. Rosensohn withdrew. On Saturday afternoon, Mr. Tulin and Dr. Weizmann's secretary, after telephoning to me, came down town, and it was suggested that there be added at the beginning of the first paragraph, at that time reading, "The Zionist Organization of America will forthwith take steps to institute the Keren Hayesod in the United States, and to that end will invite the co-operation of all Jewry," the immensely surprising words "at the instance of the World Zionist Organization," so that it read "at the instance of the World Zionist Organization, the Zionist Organization of America will forthwith take steps to institute the Keren Hayesod in the United States, and to that end will invite the co-operation of all Jewry."

I acquiesced in that amendment, but I was compelled to state to the gentlemen that there should be no drafting of the agreement, in view of the action that morning, until I knew definitely from Dr. Weizmann himself that he was again ready to agree to the exclusive donation fund. In fact that night at my apartment I was called up on the telephone by Dr. Weizmann and he stated "I agree to the exclusive donation fund." Thereupon I immediately telephoned to Mr. Rosensohn and asked him to go immediately to Dr. Weizmann's secretary and to put into form the entire agreement tentatively reached between Dr. Weizmann and myself, not an agreement, not agreed to by his colleagues, not even agreed until fully drawn up by him, but as I have always said tentatively agreed to by both of us. He met three gentlemen, not one, and they spent the night there fixing it up. If any of them conceived that he was acting as arbitrator, as intermediary, or in any other capacity, but that of a secretary contingent to form the agreement tentatively reached between Dr. Weizmann and myself, he completely erred as to his functions. So much for that part.

The next morning the agreement was presented. The two new matters were formulated. The rest of the matters remained as theretofore formulated. Instead of the words to which I have consented, "At the instance of the World Zionist Organization," the following was instituted as the beginning of the agreement: "In pursuance of the proclamation of the president of the World Zionist Organization, calling for the establishment of the Keren Hayesod in the United States, the Zionist Organization of America will proceed forthwith to take steps to institute the Keren Hayesod in the United States and to that end will invite the co-operation of all Jewry." Well, it was not in pursuance of the proclamation at all. And I considered whether those words and whether the other words of the both sections were acceptable in full. The morning was nearly past. Judge Rosenblatt has said "If we wanted political advantage, we could have asked whether you accept or reject the agreement." But we did not do that. I called up Mr. Rosensohn and told him it was off. Judge Rosenblatt is mistaken. From the rooms of the

other party, ten minutes before Judge Rosenblatt gave that message, Mr. Tulin called up and asked the very political question that Judge Rosenblatt prides himself upon not having asked. He said, "Well, have you accepted the agreement?" and Mr. Rosensohn said, "We are still considering it." And ten minutes later, not desiring the political advantage, which was sought to be obtained in the manner I have just stated, Judge Rosenblatt delivered his message. Those, ladies and gentlemen, are the exact facts. (Applause.) I speak from absolute personal knowledge, and I have said only the things which are within my personal knowledge. I come now to the past week. Judge Rosenblatt has spoken several times about the agreement of Friday. He has not spoken about the draft agreement of Wednesday, June 1st, a copy of which I have here. That is the agreement that I referred to this morning, that was read to me over the telephone to Chicago, as the suggestion of Mr. Samuel Untermyer (whose name I did not mention, but since it has been mentioned now by Judge Rosenblatt, I use it), after he had had a long talk with some of the parties, I don't know with whom. I told you this morning that I accepted this draft at once. The telegram was of the next day, and contained those conditions that I referred to this morning. A long distance telephone to the same effect came on Friday last, and again contained the elimination of Frankfurter and de Haas.

Interruption—DELEGATE: Will you read the letter?

JUDGE MACK: There is no need of going into the details. I rejected over the telephone yesterday morning, on that account, even the Wednesday proposal that I have accepted. Yesterday Mr. Rosensohn brought the whole draft of Friday, the third, and with it the renewal of the general agreement, not in writing, for the elimination of these men, including Ben Cohen. Let me digress. Judge Rosenblatt has been very kind in his reference to Ben Cohen. Others have not. None know him as well as I. Judge Rosenblatt has referred to his two and one-half years of service in London and in Paris. This has been pointed out by Mr. Stein in beautiful language, as against the miserable editorial in the *New Maccabaeon* in regard to him, an editorial that is a disgrace.

MR. AVNER: Who is Mr. Stein?

JUDGE MACK: Mr. Weizmann's secretary, a fine able gentleman, a barrister of England. Mr. Stein has written a letter telling what he knows about Ben Cohen. Let me add one more thought about Ben Cohen. When the Reorganization Commission went to Palestine the World Zionist Executive asked Ben Cohen to act as Acting Treasurer of the whole World Zionist Organization in the absence of the Treasurer, and vested him with the plenary powers of Julius Simon, a member of the World Zionist Organization. I hardly need say more in addition to what Mr. Stein so graciously said about Mr. Cohen.

I come down to Saturday morning, yesterday morning, when Mr. Rosensohn brought this new document. I would put both documents in the record, that of the 1st and that of the 3d of June, and then in the future you may read it and see whether my statement is correct, a statement that is embodied in two statements, because after stating to Mr. Rosensohn that I should reject that agreement, both on its merits and because of the general agreement that conditioned it, I was called up on the 'phone by Senator Straus, who was acting with Mr. Untermyer in these last endeavors of peace. I read to him over the 'phone a telegram

which I stated to him I should send to him and to Mr. Untermyer at once, and they were sent, and except for the change of names, Mr. Untermyer and Straus, the telegram read as follows:

"When the original memorandum suggested, as I understand, by Mr. Untermyer was read to me over the 'phone on Wednesday last, I accepted it as a fair adjustment of the principles involved, and authorized the statement that I would sign it.

"Yesterday when changes suggested by you on behalf of yourself and Untermyer were submitted to Rosensohn, with the statement that Weizmann and Untermyer would sign this second version in New York immediately if I did, Rosensohn advised that it be submitted to me in person, as I was en route to Cleveland at the time. This morning Rosensohn brings a memorandum affirmed by Weizmann totally nullifying Untermyer's previous proposal.

"This memorandum as construed by Weizmann personally to Rosensohn makes contributions mean not donations alone, but co-mingled donations and investments. Further the Keren Hayesod in the United States is made a branch of the London corporation your prior memorandum agreed was formed in violation of terms of London resolution. Also it makes Keren Hayesod in the United States solely of World Organization and not of Zionist Organization of America.

"These alone, apart from other changes, as you will be the first to realize, prevent acceptance. But still worse, Weizmann insists as verbal condition to any agreement, complete elimination of de Haas and Frankfurter. In a word, the issues of principle on which the whole controversy is based are not met by the latest Weizmann proposal and what are alleged to be issues of principles are sought to be comprised by personal vendetta."

Mr. Straus was amazed, he tells me today, when he received this telegram and when I telephoned him this, and so yesterday afternoon he called up Mr. Tulin to verify the statement as to the gentleman's agreement of elimination of certain persons, and as Senator Straus tells me—I regret that I have to quote hearsay evidence, but the witness is present—Mr. Tulin confirmed this statement, saying it is not in the agreement of course, but it is a verbal definite agreement.

I stated this morning that I was awakened at six o'clock this morning by a lengthy telegram from Mr. Untermyer in which Mr. Untermyer stated that this elimination was no part, and he made some argument about the agreement itself. After I had talked to Mr. Straus on his arrival this morning, I answered Mr. Untermyer's telegram and stated to him what Mr. Straus stated to me. At dinner this evening, after presenting the matter to you this afternoon, I received another telegram from Mr. Untermyer. The telegram reads:

"Regardless of what Weizmann said, he makes no condition concerning de Haas or Frankfurter." I have made no charges of any kind against anybody. Dr. Weizmann is the last man to be on trial here. But I make no charges of any kind against him. I present the facts chronologically for the record. I present to you my justification for the action I have taken. On the question of personal privilege, involving the assertion that I had omitted something and had incorrectly stated other things, I have endeavored to give you a full and complete answer. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Chairman wants to make one or two announcements so that later at the adjournment there will not be so much confusion.

The first announcement is that the session tomorrow, Monday, will be held at the Chamber of Commerce Hall, directly across the public square, at ten o'clock. The second announcement is one which the Chair asks permission to make and it is this: that at the opening of the session tomorrow morning I will call another member to the Chair and will thereupon offer the following resolution for the immediate consideration of the Convention involving the suspension of all rules and orders to the contrary and it reads:

"RESOLVED, That it is the sense and direction of this Convention that in its future deliberations no further reference be made to the negotiations heretofore conducted between the executives of the World Zionist and of the American Zionist Organization, but that the question at issue be limited to the acceptance, with or without amendments, or the rejection by this Convention of the Keren Hayesod.

Tomorrow morning I shall offer it and ask your humble permission to address you on the subject. I wish to present Mr. Rosensohn.

MR. ROSENZOHN: Mr. Chairman and fellow Zionists. I am just going to present to you the facts with regard to two transactions. I never was an arbitrator. We understood definitely, Mr. Stein, as Dr. Weizmann's and myself as Judge Mack's secretary, that we were draftsmen merely to draft the tentative agreement made between April 13th and April 16th between Dr. Weizmann and Judge Mack. Mr. Rosenblatt is mistaken in thinking that we had any other function than that of draftsmen.

JUDGE ROSENBLATT: On a point of order, I am sorry to interrupt; I believe it is improper and out of order to discuss before this Convention matters excepting those which are officially on record. We have a right to discuss official action of the Executive Committee of the National Organization, of the Zionist Organization of America, special actions that were taken at London. Any other official action which was included in the report of the Chairman, all other matters which involve negotiations between Mr. Tulin, Mr. Rosensohn, or any other gentlemen, is, Mr. Chairman, entirely irrelevant and out of order. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The point of order comes too late. The matter has been opened.

MR. ROSENZOHN: That very night instead of finding only Mr. Stein, I found Mr. Stein and Mr. Tulin and Mr. Rosenblatt as representing Dr. Weizmann and I myself came there as representing Judge Mack. Mr. Rosenblatt did think for a moment and only for a moment that we had any other function besides merely acting as draftsmen and if you will remember, Mr. Rosenblatt, everybody in that room said you don't know what you are talking about. The next morning I presented to Judge Mack and some of his associates the agreement as drafted. I want to first state that the first clause was modified—the first clause was read before them, "at the first clause was modified—the first clause was read before them, "at the request of the World Zionist Organization, the Zionist Organization of America shall proceed forthwith with the institution of the Keren Hayesod." We changed that at the request of Mr. Stein who is here and Mr. Tulin and Mr. Rosenblatt in order to enable Dr. Weizmann to get his associates to agree with it. They thought that in that form it would be more acceptable than in the form as it was presented and it

was for that reason we changed it and I stated I would have to submit it to Judge Mack and his associates with that correction.

The next morning it has been explained already that I first received a telephone message from Mr. Tulin asking whether Judge Mack had accepted or rejected the agreement. I stated we were still considering the agreement. Ten minutes later I received word from Mr. Rosenblatt that the agreement had been rejected. I called upon him in order to confirm it and I called up Mr. Stein, Dr. Weizmann's secretary, and he stated that I had better go to Dr. Weizmann. I did go to Dr. Weizmann and he stated that he did reject the agreement and he added "I will issue the proclamation at once." As to last week, last week I received word from Judge Mack—it was a week ago Saturday—that Mr. Untermyer had called him up and suggested that I go down to see him in company with Cohen and he wanted to discuss the question whether an adjustment could not have been reached. I called up Mr. Untermyer and Mr. Rosenblatt agreed to come there. He had arranged with Mr. Untermyer to be there at the same time and we discussed with him the issues. We, I mean Mr. Cohen and myself, explained to him that there was no question of the supremacy of the World Zionist Organization.

Everyone conceded that supremacy. The only question involved was as to the method of raising the money, and I pointed out that under the constitution of the World Zionist Organization the raising of the money which is expected from each affiliated Federation, is left to the Federation itself, the money being raised solely for the World Zionist Organization. A further reason for leaving the method to each Federation, was that the laws of the countries in regard to income tax differed, and by adopting its own method, that of a donation fund, the Zionist Federation of America could avoid the payment of income tax on contributions to the Keren Hayesod. Mr. Untermyer stated that apart from the constitutional considerations the method were best left to each Federation as it was best acquainted with conditions in its own country. Mr. Untermyer said that the Charter of the Keren Hayesod was to be changed, as it involved the transfer of the power of the World Zionist Organization, which, being the responsible body by the mandate, should have complete control. He therefore suggested that the Keren Hayesod be made a collection agency and in the United States it be made a donation fund. He was to prepare the safeguards. That agreement Judge Mack accepted on Wednesday.

Mr. Tulin and Judge Rosenblatt stated they were afraid of what might happen at this convention. They wanted to keep men in the movement. No one suggested that Dr. Weizmann should support Judge Mack at his request, but only because he wanted Judge Mack in the movement. It was because they thought Judge Mack and Mr. Brandeis valuable in the movement that they wanted peace secured. Never, never for one minute has anyone suggested that Judge Mack wanted to make peace that he might preserve himself. Is that correct, Mr. Rosenblatt?

JUDGE ROSENBLATT: I say it now: I do not want to lose them. I want peace. But peace or no peace I do not want to lose any man.

There was considerable interruption here on the part of the delegates, and the Chairman was forced to call the convention to order.

MR. ROSENTOHN: It was on Wednesday that the suggestion was made that Mr. de Haas and Mr. Frankfurter be eliminated.

Interruption—DELEGATE: Who made the suggestion?

MR. ROSENTOHN: The suggestion was made by Mr. Tulin and Mr. Rosenblatt.

There was a demonstration of disbelief on part of some of the delegates at this remark:

THE CHAIRMAN: I submit that interruptions and laughter are out of order.

MR. ROSENTOHN: Mr. Tulin was the man from whom I received the agreement agreed to by Dr. Weizmann. I did not receive it from Mr. Untermyer or Dr. Weizmann. I state these facts only because Mr. Rosenblatt has referred to them. I further wish to bring out one fact in justice to Dr. Weizmann. He was not in New York City either on Tuesday or Wednesday. He further states, and I would not doubt his word, that he never made such conditions. I think that he may have made remarks from which someone might be justified in making an inference to that extent.

There was considerable interruption here on the part of the delegates.

MR. ROSENTOHN, continuing, referred to the legal form of the charter of the Keren Hayesod, and asserted that its form limited the membership to fifty, and that this membership would have no physical connection with the World Zionist Organization. There were to be millions of contributors who would not have a voice in the Keren Hayesod.

MR. LIPSKY, interrupting, asked whether Mr. Rosensohn had meant to convey that the incorporators of the Keren Hayesod had proceeded on their own authority and had not been appointed by the London executive. Mr. Lipsky further pointed out that there was a resolution in the minutes of the London meeting authorizing the legalization of the Keren Hayesod by the London executive.

On relevant question from Mr. Rosenblatt, Mr. Rosensohn stated that the statutes of the Keren Hayesod made it virtually impossible for members not resident in London to attend any of the meetings of the Keren Hayesod, so that even the Chaluzim would be excluded.

Amid considerable interruption Judge Rosenblatt asked whether the Chaluzim or contributors in America could not elect members to the Keren Hayesod in London.

MR. ROSENTOHN: The London Conference Resolution with regard to the Keren Hayesod provides that the contributors have a voice, but they cannot have a voice under the charter as it is. I could within one day draw up a charter which would satisfy the London Conference resolution, and which would not be unlawful, unauthorized, transferring all the power of the World Zionist Organization to the Keren Hayesod.

The London Conference Resolution provides that 20 per cent of the funds should be turned over to the Jewish National Fund. That is not mentioned in the Charter. Why should this depend on the will of the incorporators when there is the express command of the London Conference? The London Conference Resolution provides that two-thirds of the funds shall be used for investing purposes: the resolution says *must*, not *can*, or *if you can*, or if a board of directors whom you will select to trust will do it if they think right. The resolution commands. There is nothing in the Charter that requires these things to be done by the Board of Directors.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next speaker to be recognized is Mr. Neumann, but before he speaks Judge Mack wishes to make a statement of correction following a conference between himself and Dr. Weizmann.

JUDGE MACK: It is suggested to me that some may have gained the impression that I had intended to say that Dr. Weizmann first accepted Mr. Untermeyer's first proposals of June 1st and subsequently rejected them and then accepted the proposals of June 3d. I did not so state. I did not intend to leave any such impression, but in addition to that, I was mistaken in something which I did not state. I did not suppose although I did not state it, that the draft of June 1st had been submitted not only by telephoning to me, but had been submitted to Dr. Weizmann, and that he had rejected it, and that on his rejection the draft of June 3d was drawn up. Dr. Weizmann states the facts to be these: That he was out of the city June 1st, that the draft of June 1st was not submitted to him in writing, that on June 2d he had a personal conversation with Mr. Untermeyer and that the only written draft submitted to him was that of June 3d after his personal conversation with Mr. Untermeyer of June 2d, and that in that draft of June 3d, he made some correction and that that draft of June 3d was the one that was brought here yesterday morning. Dr. Weizmann further states to me that although there were conversations in which the matter of the elimination of one and perhaps two, but he thinks not of the third person, was talked about, he did not authorize Mr. Tulin to state the elimination of these gentlemen in the form of a gentleman's agreement as a condition to the considerations of June 3d. I make this statement on the basis of the statement to Dr. Weizmann and the chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: In order to secure a fair and equal presentation of this important issue, the Chair is going to announce in advance the order of the next two speakers, Mr. Neumann to be followed by Senator Nathan Straus of New York.

MR. NEUMANN: I have been so long—two years or more—a member of the National Executive Committee in company with so many distinguished minds, that I have contracted the habit of collecting documents, and I had hoped to retaliate this evening by coming to a Zionist meeting and reading reams of them off. But I think it would be a mistaken policy on my part to presume on your patience. I will say this: it is well known in military science that the best defensive is an offensive, and it seems to me that our administration, coming to us at the end of the year to render an account of its stewardship, has thought it best to take the offensive, to criticise, to attack, to attack mercilessly. But let us not allow ourselves to be diverted from the true business before us. Our true business here is not to pass judgment upon the World Zionist Organization. There is a time and place for that. We did it in full at London, and we shall do it again at the next Congress. But here and now, in our Convention, at the close of one year, and on presentation of the report, it is our business to pass judgment on our own administration. (Applause.)

We have before us the document purporting to be the report of the President. Unfortunately the name of the President has been made so conspicuous that one might be tempted to think that he is personally subject to all this criticism. I deplore this situation. We have the highest

regard for the personality of many of our leaders, but that is not the question. We are not discussing Judge Mack. I always resent this commingling of personal issues with questions of principle. We do trust them as individuals. But were I to analyze paragraph by paragraph this report I could show that, despite any statements to the contrary, no man can be trusted to be fairminded in his own case. In this report there are truths told, of course, but there are also half truths and many facts are suppressed entirely, and I could show them to you if I had the time. Take the Keren Hayesod. Here is what purports to be a fair analysis. And yet I have not seen in this analysis any allusion to the very fundamental fact that the World Organization is ready to remove any of the directors and replace them. Why is that not stated? There are here any number of exhibits not of what we have done, of what we have accomplished, but of what we have been prevented from accomplishing.

When we sent our statement to the *New Palestine*, I asked Judge Mack to print alongside the official version of what took place at the meeting; the statement of the minority. That letter was not acknowledged, and in these exhibits you will find no reference to the things we said.

Judge Mack has made reference to an outrageous article in the new magazine in reference to Mr. Ben Cohen. Gentlemen, that article in the new magazine was inspired by indignation at something which was printed in our magazine. I want to say that in the Yiddish journals, in the *Yiddish Folk*, this most offensive phrase was omitted, but I ask you, what is your characterization of this? We are speaking here of the president of the World Zionist Organization and we mix him in one breath with a gentleman whose achievement we do not know, whose record we do not know, no matter how meritorious he himself might be. He might be a most estimable man. "When I told Weizmann that I would bring Ben Cohen he begged me not to do so." Why? "Weizmann knew that Ben Cohen was stubborn and would resist him in every struggle against right."

You have heard a lot of legal arguments by Mr. Rosensohn, and you have heard a good deal of discussion as to whether A. Tulin said this or that. Frankly it does not interest me in spite of the fact that our friend has been in the midst of this thing. I told him I wished he were out of it. I do not know what history will have to say about this series of negotiations. Perhaps some names that would otherwise have remained obscure will have to go down to condemnation.

Most of these negotiators, it seems to me, acted without authority, and too many cooks spoil the broth. I have told the story of the beginning of this break. I have told the story of the two years since the Chicago Convention. There was an unmistakable tendency on the part of our administration to develop separate work in Palestine. I was present at that convention. And I was present at every meeting of the American delegation in London, when we were asked to say that we had no nomination to make to the Inner Actions Committee. We were given the opportunity to exercise the proper control from the inside, as friends, but we refused. The delegates were in favor of it—but the leaders of the delegation said No. Mr. de Haas volunteered this information, and this was the first step in the policy of Mr. Brandeis. We were going to

develop a program of work in Palestine independent of the World Organization. It was common knowledge in London that this was the policy of the American administration, and Mr. de Haas said to me he could not see how the World Organization could do the job in Palestine. This was his theory, and I have reason to assume that he reflected faithfully the theory and principles of the administration, and we know the administration stood for these things whether it said it or not. At the Chicago convention the presiding officer made a lengthy statement which 90 per cent of the delegation, not lawyers, but Jews with common sense, interpreted as meaning that we were to stand by the World Organization, that this talk of separatism was to be killed, and that we were not to do anything in Palestine which was not in accordance with the World Organization. And yet it did permit us to start a fund to work in Palestine—the Keren Hayesod will collect funds for sanitation and administration. I cannot understand that kind of logic. But here and now we have to go on record, clearly, beyond all doubt, that we stand behind Weizmann and the World Organization. (Loud applause and cheers.)

We have heard a good deal about the Keren Hayesod, about its exclusiveness, and the danger it represents. Let me tell you something about the history of our stand towards the Keren Hayesod. We had discussed the Keren Hayesod, and some of us, Mr. Schweitzer and myself amongst others, were impatient at our organization having taken no stand in regard to the Keren Hayesod. At one meeting, when I asked what was going to be done, I was told that we could not take any stand until the Keren Hayesod had been put into definite form. I then said if we have any suggestions, then in Heaven's name let us not wait until the details of the Keren Hayesod had been worked out, and then proceed to jump on it. Let us tell them now what we would like the Keren Hayesod to be. I think the Honorary President of the Organization rose then and criticized me, saying, "You have no right to do these things. We must wait until Mr. Flexner's return from London." The gentlemen in London could not wait. But we have waited ten months and done nothing for Palestine. We had in our possession the letter about the land bank, but that letter was never presented to the Executive Committee, and the administration never even went to the trouble of getting a vote on it. And then the resolution was passed, but the bank is not here yet. We debated a resolution about a distributing agency in Palestine. We had a long meeting about war supplies.

You have heard a list of private corporations, corporations which have been, which might have been, which are preparing, which are going to prepare, but not five dollars has gone to Palestine throughout the year. We have done nothing for Palestine, and as far as Keren Hayesod was concerned we said we will wait. We refused the responsibility. We thrust it upon these other gentlemen. Palestine could not wait and they proceeded to organize the Keren Hayesod as best they could. It was our business to go forward and say, "Gentlemen, let us do things," and do them, and not jump upon them for this or that mistake. Stranger than everything is the fact that the gentleman who sent to us the charter of the Keren Hayesod attached to that very charter a memorandum on the legal status of the Keren Hayesod, copy of which I have taken the trouble to make. That attached memorandum, stated as clearly as human ingenuity could state, that this charter was provisional and they pointed

out that the things about which you speak, the representation of contributors, the board of directors, and the rest could be changed, and they wanted to have suggestions from the various federations. That was a fair and honest thing on their part, and at a meeting of April 9th a gentleman saw that attached memorandum, and, knowing the proposals were made from London, stated they had no right to come out in the press and charge these people with a breach of faith and lack of faith and attempting to capture the Keren Hayesod. (Applause.) I have a copy of that memorandum here.

Interruption—DELEGATE: Read it.

MR. NEUMANN: I will read a section of it. I heard some remarks made by Judge Mack. I say that this copy was attached to the printed charter of the Keren Hayesod which I handed personally on the evening of April 9th to Dr. Mossinsohn, who handed it to Dr. Weizmann. It was circulated among the members of the American Administration and some members made pencil marks on it. It was on the desk before Judge Mack and I believe that Judge Mack could see and make something out of the statement before him, and if not, he could have asked for it again and again and gone over it and see what it was before they spoke about a committee of fifty which was less than forty-five. Judge Dannenbaum had his name on this committee and he never gave his consent, but that is another story. There is a paragraph in the memorandum: the statutes constitute merely an outline. All the power rests with the Zionist Executive which is free to make all arrangements regarding directors and all other matters pending the meeting of the Action Committee or Congress which can put things on a permanent basis. And in accordance with the London Resolution, they had here a resolution that in each country or group of countries, an annual gathering of certificate holders shall take place. For this election each certificate holder shall have one vote and no more. Naturally such representatives may be chosen to the Keren Hayesod body instead of all special meetings of that country's certificate holders.

In each country or group of countries, an annual gathering of certificate holders shall take place. This gathering shall elect representatives to the *Council* of the Keren Hayesod. (For these elections each certificate holder shall have one vote and no more.) Naturally such representatives may be chosen by the Keren Hayesod body already existing in any country instead of by a special meeting of that country's certificate holders. The number of representatives will be fixed in accordance with the aggregate of the country's contribution to the Keren Hayesod.

Some of you may need this document. I will point out one glaring contradiction in the attitude of the Administration. They say why did not that charter go into specifications and details and make make it final and fixed? I will assume the opposite. Supposing these gentlemen had not merely incorporated these things in a broad general way, but had filled in the details and presented us with a complete charter. Do you think the criticism coming from America would have been less? Don't you think we would have said, "What right have you without consulting us to make these final permanent things in the charter of the Keren Hayesod?"

Let me say further that the joint lawyers' Committee argued that

according to the resolution of the London Conference these conditions were not final or binding, they were loose and could be changed. They asked further, how dared those gentlemen adopt a charter which was not in accord with the London resolution. But the issue in this whole business was a tacitly understood policy of separatism, and not so tacitly understood either, for Mr. de Haas was perfectly willing to discuss it. We saw that policy developing from day to day. It was in this way that a resolution of the London Conference placed the Medical Unit under the World Zionist Organization. One of the arguments raised was that the Joint Distribution Committee would not give its funds if the Medical Unit were placed under the World Zionist Organization. But the fact happens to be, as far as I know, that the Joint Distribution Committee never took any such stand. I am told that the Joint Distribution Committee is prepared today to put its money together with the Keren Hayesod with the land mortgage bank in Palestine. I say that Mr. Marshall and the Joint Distribution Committee have that confidence. Our administration has not that confidence. That is where the trouble lies. Now we have come to the end of the business and there are cries for peace.

If it is a question of peace with the Convention of the Zionist Organization of America, I think Dr. Weizmann has that peace. (Applause.) I desire to see that peace. How long shall we be concerned with individuals in the movement? Is it not time that the Zionist Organization took back its original character of a great national democratic movement? How long shall we remain under the lash? How long shall we have the threat of resignation thrown into our faces every time we dare to have our own opinions? I have made up my mind. I wish to see these gentlemen in the ranks of the Zionist movement, but they must subject themselves to that discipline which they demand of us. (Applause.) We have been a minority for years. I always believed that the minority plus right makes the majority, but whilst we were the minority, we were told that it was our privilege either to put up or shut up. We were accused of having broken discipline, of having gone out and published statements in the press, which of course we did because we could not get them into the *New Palestine*. But let me tell you that before the *New Palestine* was in existence and we wanted it as an organ for Zionist education, Judge Mack said there was no need of education. But he has found out since then the value of carrying on propaganda. (Applause.)

Interruption—DR. WISE: Tell the facts.

MR. NEUMANN: I try to tell the facts as well as any man. I will tell you the details of that meeting in the administrative meeting when we were considering the legality and the purpose of education. I was then connected with the Department of Education. Dr. Wise questioned the accuracy of my statements.

Interruption—DR. WISE: In quotation of Judge Mack.

MR. NEUMANN: I say this. We had a meeting in the Administrative Committee. I urged that the department be not completely done away with, that a certain nucleus be retained. I said we may not have a department for Hebrew education, but I suggested the possibility of having someone in the office to carry on a certain amount of so-called Zionist education, namely, such as the sending out of literature and lectures among Jews.

I said, "Have certain outlines sent out to the district for discussion and information?" He said, "On what?" and I said, "On questions of Zionism," and then Judge Mack expressed himself substantially in this sense: He said he could not conceive of the Organization in that form. He said we were over-organized. We had districts and regional organizations and things of that kind, and he thought we were spending too much money on that and that there was no need for it. We should be an organization of members, individuals, each one paying so much a year, we get together, elect officers, and the officers will conduct the business of the organization. I said to him something like this: "The Hebrew Emigrant Aid Society?" He said "Yes"; and Lipsky was there and he said, "Something like the Jewish Publication Society of Philadelphia?" Judge Mack may not agree with me as to the exact phrase, but I left the meeting with the impression that there was no desire on the part of the Administration to carry on any of the Zionist education except that which was in the nature of information regarding the work in Palestine and regarding the work of the organization for Palestine. That really is not so important. If I have made a mistake Judge Mack will correct it. On April 29th this issue of the *New Palestine* was published. There was a great appeal, "Let the Voice of the Zionists be Heard," a call for the Convention, and the greatest stress was laid upon the Convention by the Administration. At that time there were some Zionists who were very much disgruntled and even grumbled at going to the Convention. It was feared there might be a revolt against the leaders, which fortunately has not materialized. The following appears as one paragraph:

"The officers of the Zionist Organization of America feel that the last word in this unfortunate controversy should be spoken by the rank and file, by the members of the Zionist Organization of America. It is up to them to say whether or not they approve of the stand taken by the present Administration. It is up to them to decide whether they wish to have the Keren Hayesod in America collect funds independent of the co-operation and control of their Organization. Their views must be heard and quickly translated into action."

I heartily endorse every word of that paragraph. I say this Convention represents to my best judgment and knowledge the rank and file in the Zionist Organization of America. It is up to this Convention to say whether or not it approves of the stand taken by the present Administration, and I beg of you gentlemen, do not disband and adjourn until you have given that answer and made your statement. (Applause and cheers.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I take great pleasure in presenting Senator Straus of New York.

MR. NATHAN STRAUS, JR.: Mr. Chairman, Mr. President of the World Zionist Organization, Mr. President of the Zionist Organization of America: I can promise you my remarks will be brief and will be directed not to recrimination but solely with the intent of setting aright these matters in which my name has been quoted and with the object of furthering the peace which we all desire. (Applause.)

My attitude towards the distinguished gentlemen who have honored us with their presence this evening may perhaps be better indicated by the actions in the past than by words in the present. When Dr. Chaim Weizmann arrived in this country it was I who had the privilege and

honor of putting through the Senate of the State of New York a unanimous resolution extending to him and to his distinguished comrades the handclasp of welcome. (Applause.) My respect for him, my regard for his mission is, I think, fully indicated by that act. I took no share in the negotiations or in the efforts to bring about a peace, of which I understood but little until early last week, when my father, Nathan Straus—

(At the mention of the name of Nathan Straus the entire delegation broke into unanimous applause.)

My father, who has been very sick as a result of his disappointment in a long cherished dream, asked whether perhaps I might be able to bring about a peace in the ranks. I called up Mr. Untermyer last Tuesday and asked for an appointment. If I remember rightly, it was Tuesday. It may have been Monday. At any rate, independent of Mr. Rosensohn, I saw Mr. Untermyer, and I would like you to get this point clearly in mind. I accepted what he told me as to his conceptions of the difficulties which then existed and as to the necessary basis of an adjustment. I had a long conversation with him. It was later, I believe, a few hours after Mr. Rosensohn's conversation with him, independently of Mr. Rosensohn, I drew up a memorandum of what I thought Mr. Untermyer had said. Mr. Rosensohn also drew up such a memorandum, and next morning we met in my office with Dr. Kallen to compare this memorandum. We found them practically identical. We found that they differed only in the minutest details, and Mr. Rosensohn as an attorney, which I am not, proceeded to consolidate them into written simple statement. It perhaps is not amiss to say that in the courtesy which he uniformly maintained he largely adopted the verbiage which I had set down, and therefore I can honestly assume not only responsibility for but largely the authorship of the protocol of agreement, if I may call it such, of last Wednesday. That agreement was then submitted to Mr. Untermyer. It was submitted to him as his own reasons, as his own views, as expressed to Mr. Rosensohn and myself. I took that draft down to him personally. He said to me that it agreed substantially with what we had said, with what we in our conversation had agreed to, and I said to him, "Mr. Untermyer, will you stand by what this agreement says? Will you insist on this agreement as being the terms that you will stand by and insist that the World Zionist American leaders agree to, as I feel sure they do in their official capacity—as I feel sure the leaders of the Zionist Organization of America will agree to these terms," and he would not give me a direct answer, and I said, "Mr. Untermyer, may I ask you a definite question? Do you not believe that it is necessary that the Keren Hayesod be incorporated in America purely as a donation fund, first of all to establish legal trusteeship for these donations, and secondly to enable those of us that donate to it to deduct our donations from our income tax for the purpose of income tax as is provided under the American law?" and he said "Yes." And I said, "Mr. Untermyer, do you not agree that funds collected through the Keren Hayesod . . .

The further remarks of Mr. Nathan Straus, Jr., were received with the greatest indignation by the audience, the entire delegation rising to hiss the speaker. During this hostile demonstration Dr. Weizmann rose and order was restored.

DR. WEIZMANN: I am the President of the World Zionist Organiza-

tion. I beg to declare that it was never the intention, either directly or indirectly, of either the whole community of Zionists or of individual Zionists, to use the Keren Hayesod for any other purpose than the building up of Palestine.

The audience broke into tremendous applause for Dr. Weizmann. The efforts of Mr. Nathan Straus, Jr., to proceed with his speech were drowned in a storm of hisses.

On motion from Rabbi Silver it was resolved that the offending remarks of Mr. Nathan Straus, Jr., be expunged from the records of the Convention.

When Mr. Nathan Straus was allowed to resume he explained that the offending remarks had been offered not as a statement for himself, but merely hypothetically, and that he had been interrupted in the middle of a sentence before he could make this clear. The explanation was received with applause.

The Chairman then ruled that Senator Straus should be permitted to continue his remarks the following morning, when he would be the first speaker to be recognized by the Chair.

Mr. Schulman directed the attention of the Chair to the necessity of proceeding with the organization of the Convention, and moved that before the adjournment the Chairman appoint a Committee on Committees, to consist of fifteen members. The motion was seconded and carried.

A list of fifteen members was submitted to the Chairman, who submitted the same to Judge Mack with a statement that if Judge Mack did not consider the minority fairly represented he would be ready to erase certain names and substitute others.

Judge Mack, taking the floor, stated that he did not recognize in the list a single adherent of the administration.

The Chairman replied that he had submitted this list to Dr. Wise, with a statement that he would be ready to substitute the representatives suggested by Dr. Wise, but that Dr. Wise had replied that he had no names to offer.

The Chairman finally ruled that Mr. Lipsky, the Chairman of the Conference which had adopted the list under discussion, should have five names stricken from the list. The Chairman would then substitute five names as representing the minority.

On motion of Mr. Richards, the Conference adjourned at 1:00 a. m., to reconvene at 11:00 a. m. of the same day.

THIRD SESSION

HELD IN THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUILDING, MONDAY, JUNE 6TH.

The Chairman, Judge Dannenbaum, called the Convention to order at 11 a. m.

The Chairman informed the Convention that in conformity with his ruling at the last session he had substituted on the list of names for the Committee on Committees, five new names, which had been submitted by Mr. Avner, as representing the Minority.

At this point Dr. Weizmann entered the hall. His entry was the signal for a tremendous demonstration on the part of the entire delegation.

The Chairman then proceeded to read the names of the Committee on Committees.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The names presented on behalf of the conference of which Mr. Lipsky was Chairman for membership on the Committee of Committees:

Samuel Blitz, New York (Chisholm, Minn., delegate); M. Zeldin, District of Brownsville, N. Y.; J. Hoffenberg, Hartford; M. Senn, Philadelphia; Louis Topkis, Wilmington; Samuel Benjamin, Cleveland; Robert Silverman, Boston; H. Steinberg, Chicago; J. Gabriel, Jersey City; Harry W. Freeman, Houston (San Antonio delegate).

Names presented by the Minority, submitted by Mr. Avner:

Morris Neaman, Pittsburgh; William Sauber, Green Bay; Isidor Blum, Baltimore; Julius Meyer, Boston; Samuel Rittenberg, Charleston.

The matter having been raised by Mr. B. G. Richards, Judge Mack announced that the office staff brought by the administration to Cleveland was at the disposal of the Convention. After rereading the names of the Committee on Committees, the Chairman announced that a room had been reserved in the Hotel Cleveland, and the Committee was requested to proceed thither for the continuation of its work. This would consist of the selection of the following list of Committees: this done, the Committee on Committees would report back to the Convention.

The Committee on Committees is to appoint the following committees of the Convention:

1. A committee of fifteen to consider the budget and all financial questions and present resolutions to the Convention.
2. A committee of fifteen to consider resolutions bearing upon the Keren Hayesod and the methods to be employed for raising this fund.
3. A committee of fifteen to consider the methods to be employed in the forthcoming Zionist Congress elections and to present resolutions to the Convention.
4. A committee of fifteen to consider Zionist publications and periodicals and to present resolutions to the Convention.
5. A committee of fifteen to consider all general resolutions submitted

by delegates or formulated by them and to present them to the Convention.

6. A committee on nominations to present the nominations for officers of the Zionist Organization of America and members of the National Executive Committee.

7. A Convention Election Board of nine which shall be in charge of the elections to be held at this Convention.

8. A committee of fifteen on organization to which all resolutions on organization and administration matters should be referred, and which should report resolutions on those subjects to the Convention.

The Chairman then gave the floor to Mr. Morris Rothenberg.

MR. MORRIS ROTHENBERG: It is difficult to conceive a more unfortunate and untimely event in Jewish life than the present controversy between the American Zionist Administration and the World Zionist Organization. At the moment when Jews should be straining every effort towards bringing forth the men and the money with which to create the Jewish Homeland, the American Zionist Administration found it advisable to begin and carry on a war within our own ranks, a war which could only result in incalculable injury to our cause.

The end of this war, however, will not come by devoutly wishing for peace. It can only come, first, by understanding the issues involved, and secondly, by quickly and effectively determining them. Then only shall we be able to divert our attention from the deplorable business of public controversy to that of work for the rebuilding of Palestine.

If there are any here who think that we went into this conflict with any *Kampfslust*, let me tell them that they are mistaken, that never did men enter into a struggle with sadder hearts than we did, because we knew what it involved. We knew that it required taking up a position against many men whom we respected, even loved, against men with whom we had been working side by side for years, and we knew that bitter feelings would be engendered. But we did not create this conflict. We kept silent as long as it was possible, but, my friends, there comes a time when silence is treason. (Applause.)

The controversy is two-fold:

First, there is an issue between the World Zionist Organization and the American Zionist Organization. That issue this Convention is not in a position to decide. The body to adjudicate a dispute between a Federation and the parent Organization is the Zionist Congress.

Second, there is an issue between the present Administration of the American Zionist Organization and its membership. That is, shall the Administration be supported in the action it has taken in its relations to the World Zionist Organization, or shall we disapprove of its actions? Obviously if this issue is determined against the American Zionist Administration the first issue fails.

The Zionists of the country have been swamped with newspapers, magazines, letters and literature of every description relating to the differences that have arisen.

While they may not have been able to follow all of the great mass of material, they probably have by this time grasped the fundamental principles involved. But as the decisive word with regard to the controversy in the American Organization must be given by this Convention, it will be well to review the essential facts in the case.

The seeds of the present controversy were undoubtedly sown long before the London conference of July, 1920. Differences in temperament and in fundamental conceptions of Jewish life and traditions, and even social factors, have surely played a part in bringing about the present unfortunate situation. But these are matters which it is difficult and probably not profitable to go into. For our purpose we shall confine ourselves to the facts as they were revealed beginning with the London Conference, because there for the first time there was an open clash followed by definite action, which is now a part of the record.

It was generally recognized before the London Conference opened, that it would be necessary to make some changes in the composition of the International Zionist Executive so that it might be more suitable to the new conditions that had arisen in our movement. There had been no Congress for seven years. Many of the persons who occupied positions in the World Zionist Administration were elected at a time when the requirements were quite different from those which were presented in consequence of the recent political events in our movement. It was thought also that the various funds and institutions which had been created by the Zionist Organization might need readjustment so as to more effectively meet the new conditions. It was therefore mutually agreed upon by all of the delegates present that the London Conference, which legally was only a *Yahreskonferenz*, should in fact have the powers of a Congress, and the procedure of the Conference was based on that theory.

On July 14, 1920, after the Conference had proceeded for some time and much discussion had taken place, the leader of the American Delegation delivered an address in which he laid before it his views on the problems confronting our movement and the indispensable requirements for the upbuilding of a Jewish Homeland in Palestine.

The essential feature of his address was that the World Zionist Executive must be recast if the work ahead were to be successfully accomplished. He regarded most of the members of the Executive Committee as then constituted, as unsuited to the tasks to be undertaken, and he developed a plan for forming an Executive Committee which involved a radical change from that which had been followed at previous congresses. That is to say, instead of the Congress electing the Executive Committee as theretofore, his idea was that the Congress elect Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Sokolow, whom he regarded as indispensable, and possibly one additional person, and that they be given full power to select an additional three or four men who together with Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Sokolow were to be given full power for a term of years to carry on the work in Palestine. The men he had in mind were such as were high in financial and social standing, preferably in England, who should command the respect and confidence of those forces which he deemed necessary to enlist in the difficult task of building Palestine. It was evident that he referred to persons who were not within the ranks of the Zionist movement. But as he was of the opinion that the period of political action had ended, it did not seem to him a matter of concern whether or not the men to be drawn into the Executive Committee were previously members of the Zionist Organization, providing they were willing to take responsibility for the work. The leader of the American Delegation also laid his plan before the *Seignorenkonvent*, which was

a large sub-committee of the London Conference composed of men from the various constituencies present. The plan developed very serious differences of opinion. The advisability of adopting it was doubted not only by the European Delegates, but also by many of the American Delegation. The opposition to the plan was principally that it involved the turning over to persons who were not Zionists the control of the Zionist Organization and the power to determine its future program and policies.

The plan was not adopted by the Conference. Thereupon our leaders took the position that no American should become a member of the new Executive Committee, and that the American Organization should take no responsibility for the conduct of the new Executive.

Immediately after the London Conference closed the American leaders met with the newly formed Executive Committee, consisting of Dr. Weizmann, Messrs. Sokolow, Ussischkin, Simon and De Lieme, the last two having seemingly been named by Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Sokolow with the hope of pleasing the American leaders, since they seemed to be regarded with high favor by them. It became clear at once that the Executive Committee was not to have a free hand in determining the character of the work to ensue or to command the support of the American Organization to their plans, and that the American leaders did not intend to place at the disposal of the Executive Committee the American Zionist resources. The American leader definitely stated to them that they could no longer rely upon the remittances of \$75,000 per month which the London office had up to that time received from the American Organization, beyond July, and would receive only the sum of \$35,000 per month to defray the expenses of the Medical Unit, and in addition \$40,000 per month during August and September as an advance on Shekolim. In other words, the International Executive was not to expect the regular remittances for Palestine work after July. This meant that the Executive would have no funds with which to do the work in Palestine excepting the pittance that it received in depreciated European currency.

It was made evident to the European representatives that having failed to accept the American plan of reorganization, funds from America could not be relied upon.

The action of the American leader at London with respect to funds was followed by a proposal to the National Executive Committee of the American Organization, which met immediately upon the return of the delegates from London, to give the newly formed World Executive no further funds excepting those referred to. Only through the persistent efforts of what are now known as the minority members of the Executive Committee, who realized the utter helplessness to which the new World Executive was being reduced, and understood that the Palestinian work would in consequence of the attitude of the American leaders be forced to stop for lack of funds, was the sum of \$25,000 per month voted by the Executive Committee, beginning with October, 1920, as a direct contribution and not as an advance upon Shekolim. Even that amount has within the last few months been reduced, first to \$15,000 per month, and now to nothing.

When Dr. Wise rose at the Buffalo Convention and with matchless eloquence defended the course of the Administration at London, there

were many of us who differed from him, but we nevertheless kept silence because we wished to do nothing that might obstruct the way to that understanding which we hoped for, of a common basis for a program of united action for Palestine.

The London Conference was not a thing that any delegate can contemplate with pleasure. The differences that arose there have left a very painful impression, not only upon Zionists but upon all Jews interested in the future of our people. The conference was looked forward to by the Zionists of the World as the event which, following the San Remo decision, would send out to the Jews of the world the clarion call for united effort in rebuilding the Jewish Homeland. The desolate and heartbroken Jewry of Eastern Europe looked to the London conference as to the place from which would stream forth the light of redemption.

Disappointing as the London Conference was, it nevertheless realized the prime necessity of creating an instrumentality through which the vast funds that were needed for Palestine might be obtained from World Jewry. It created the Keren Hayesod. It was the one thing that lifted the London Conference out of the slough into which it had fallen.

The Keren Hayesod was unanimously adopted at a session of the London Conference at which the American delegation was present. It was adopted with enthusiasm and faith that it would become the agency through which the Jews of the world would unite in a common effort to build the Jewish land.

In Germany, in Austria, in Holland, in Norway, in Lithuania, in Latvia, even the poor woe-stricken Zionists in Poland, took up with inspiration the work of the Keren Hayesod. Only in America our leaders remained cold. Here, they developed the theory, that the Keren Hayesod was impracticable. Its plan of operation was unsuited to American conditions. There must not be one fund for all purposes. A set of resolutions was worked out at Buffalo designed to destroy the entire idea of the Keren Hayesod and giving the impression of an intention to launch upon a separatistic policy.

The openly expressed fears of those who were suspicious of the intention of our Administration were met with repeated assurances that the proposed modifications of the Keren Hayesod were merely suggestions subject to the approval of the World Zionist Executive, and since the plans of the Keren Hayesod in London had not yet been clearly formulated, the assurances of loyalty to the World Organization by the Administration were accepted and no contest was made on the resolutions after safeguards were adopted that our action was subject to the World Zionist Executive.

The action of the Buffalo Convention was interpreted by the leaders of the International Zionist Organization as secession. It was so interpreted by many in this country. Had that action not followed the events of the London Conference and the attitude there exhibited by the American leaders, it is doubtful whether such interpretation would have been placed upon it, but the action at Buffalo seemed to fit in with that of the previous action of the American leaders in cutting off the funds of the World Executive. It became clearer each day that the action at Buffalo was much more significant than we had then understood, and that the chasm between the American Organization and the World Organization leaders was much wider than was suspected. The Zionists

in the country grew discouraged and Zionist work came to a standstill. Let me interject at this point. At the London Conference both Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Justice Brandeis said to us that there is no time to be lost; that we must accomplish something substantial in Palestine immediately. One of them said we must achieve practical results there within eighteen months, the other said two years. Of course they did not mean that in that short space of time we must create the Jewish Homeland, but that the foundation at least must be laid within that time, so that the political powers, and especially England, might see that we were in earnest, and that we were not merely talking, but working. I had supposed that after those statements were made we would come back to America and work feverishly in order to accomplish that which they had said must be achieved. Instead of that we came back and entered upon theoretical discussions as to the meaning of statutes which to my mind could be settled around a table within two hours if a real understanding were desired. The result was that in America the work for Palestine was paralyzed, and in the nine months following the London Conference nothing of any practical value has been achieved by our present Administration.

At this juncture it was proposed that Dr. Weizmann come to America, so that the differences that had arisen with regard to the establishment of the Keren Hayesod in this country might be adjusted and an understanding arrived at. Our Executive Committee, in a cable sent to Dr. Weizmann, urged him to come here with his associates for the purpose of arriving at an understanding on what we conceived to be the point at issue, the Keren Hayesod. The American Organization was paralyzed; the World Organization was paralyzed; and it was felt that immediate action was necessary if a calamity in the Palestinian work was to be averted.

It was clear to us that there was only one event that could rescue the Zionists of the country from the apathy into which they had fallen—that was the coming of Dr. Weizmann. We felt that only through his presence here would the Jews be reawakened and re-inspired to continue the work that was so necessary, and I thank God that we were not mistaken in that premonition. (Applause.)

I would remind you that until the moment that Dr. Weizmann and his associates, Mr. Ussischkin, Dr. Levin and Dr. Mossinsohn, stepped on our shores the work for Palestine was in a state of complete paralysis. It was only when they came that a revival of interest was created. The Zionists knew them. They had confidence in them. They knew that by years of service they had proven not only that they were capable of working for the movement, but that they were ready to lay down their lives for the cause if that were necessary. (Applause.) Until their arrival nothing had been done for nine months, and the Chalusim, of whom we all speak so reverently, were lying in all the ports of Eastern Europe and in Palestine, and a most dangerous political situation was created.

To go back, Dr. Weizmann informed us that he was leaving for America with Mr. Ussischkin and Dr. Mossinsohn, and expected to arrive about April 3d. I will not go into the details of how Dr. Weizmann was received. It will serve no useful purpose at this time. Only this I would recall to you. A week before his arrival the American leaders

thought it necessary to prepare a memorandum to be used as a basis of negotiation with Dr. Weizmann. The question had been—and there was no other question before the Buffalo Convention—that of a difference in methods of raising funds, though many suspected that there were other and grave reasons for the growing coolness of the American leaders towards the leaders of the World Organization. The memorandum was a great surprise even to the skeptical members of the Executive Committee.

The memorandum in printed form was placed in our hands a few hours before the meeting of the Executive Committee, on March 19th. Some of the members of the Executive had not received a copy when the meeting opened. It consisted of twenty-nine pages, and contained not merely the subject matter of the Keren Hayesod, but it covered a series of points involving fundamental theoretical and philosophical conceptions and definitions of Zionism, upon which the National Executive Committee had neither the authority nor the power nor the competence to pass judgment. The Executive Committee was asked to approve the principles as being the views of the American Zionist Organization, so that Judge Mack might be able to present them to Dr. Weizmann as conditions for him to agree to before the American Organization could co-operate with him and the International Executive Committee. But neither had Dr. Weizmann the power or the authority to pass judgment upon or to agree to the philosophical conceptions set forth in the memorandum. They belong as a matter of law to the Zionist Congress. Furthermore, our National Executive Committee lacked both the legal and moral right to bind those who might dissent from such views. Moreover, the memorandum contained insinuations of a serious nature, unsubstantiated by proper evidence. It was evident that the memorandum attempted to set up issues that were artificial and wholly irrelevant to a conference with Dr. Weizmann at that time. Among such supposed issues were:

PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES

"The Zionist Organization as the Jewish Agency versus the proposal, made repeatedly since 1919, to substitute for the Zionist Organization, a coalition composed of representatives of Zionist and non-Zionist organizations or of those elected by a general Jewish Congress.

"Commonwealth versus Cultural Center, primary emphasis on, and direction of activities to the economic upbuilding of Palestine, as against primary emphasis on general cultural activities. A living culture-creating and culture-radiating Israel cannot arise and endure without permanent economic foundations.

"A policy of federalism promoting strong responsible federations, as opposed to a centralization imposing rigid uniformity in methods and means as well as end.

"The Zionist Organization shall become the Jewish Agency in Palestine, displacing the Zionist Commission.

"It shall aid in the upbuilding of the Jewish Homeland, without encroaching on the functions of either the Palestinian Government or Palestinian Jewry.

"It shall foster the University and Technicum, but entrust the general school system in Palestine to Palestinian Jewry, gradually

reducing its subventions, and assisting in the formation of a body, under Palestinian Jewry, to secure general Jewish participation in the maintenance of the school work.

"The primary economic work shall be entrusted to suitable corporate or co-operative institutions under appropriate control, in place of the present centralized bureaucratic system of the Zionist Commission.

"The rights and duties of the Federations and the Fractions must be equitably determined and readjusted. At present, the fractions are practically independent of the authority of the World Organization and assume no financial obligations towards it, yet in combination exercise at times a controlling voice. This is representation without taxation. Such an intolerable situation must be changed.

"On the one hand, the World Organization shall apply to *Gegenwartsarbeit* only the funds specifically given for that purpose, and on the other hand, each Federation shall have the right to refrain from participation in *Gegenwartsarbeit*."

"In order to strengthen the Federations, and to enhance the interest of Jewries outside of Palestine in Palestinian work, the World Organization shall, in its discretion, transfer to Federations the initiative in certain undertakings, with proper public safeguards, and subject to the co-ordinating authority of the World Organization."

All of these matters were clearly within the purview of the Zionist Congress. Dr. Weizmann had no authority to pass upon them even had he desired to do so.

The action of the Administration is best characterized in a statement which the minority members of the Executive Committee issued, which among other things said:

"This document which took several weeks on the part of Judge Mack and his advisers to prepare, was not placed in the hands of the members of the Executive Committee until a few hours before the meeting. No time was given the members to read the statement with care, to examine its implications, to inquire into the charges contained therein, or to formulate and propose necessary changes or substitute proposals. Some of us pleaded that a delay of at least one week be granted under the circumstances. Others insisted that all these matters be laid over until Dr. Weizmann had had an opportunity to state his views to the Executive Committee. But these objections and requests were denied; and in spite of the repeated protests of the members that they could not in such a hurried manner morally vote "yes" or "no" on proposals developed in a compilation covering twenty-nine pages of printed matter of the gravest concern and consequence to the Zionist Movement, the statement was put to a vote under a rule shutting off discussion with fourteen voting for approval and ten declining to vote.

"Not only was this action forced in a hasty and ill-considered manner, but without the authorization of the Executive Committee the Summary has been published and distributed broadcast. In addition, the Supporting Memorandum, which the Committee was repeatedly assured was to be regarded purely as Judge Mack's own personal argument in support

of the Summary, admittedly containing insinuations of a serious character, which, if published, might seriously damage the Zionist cause, was also published and circulated. The Zionist districts have been called upon to express an opinion on what amounts to serious charges without having heard arguments on both sides and before Dr. Weizmann had had an opportunity to be heard. It is evident that the publication of the document within less than a week of the arrival of Dr. Weizmann could have no other effect than to prejudice opinion against the World Zionist Administration and to confuse the Zionists of this country.

"We did not deem it proper or necessary at the meeting nor do we deem it proper or necessary now to enter into a discussion of the matter contained in the statement. The most elementary courtesy, fairness and justice to Dr. Weizmann and his associates demand that we shall first hear what Dr. Weizmann has to say with regard to them before any conclusions are reached by the Zionists of America."

Such was the situation with which Dr. Weizmann was confronted.

If that was the way that the leaders of the American Organization thought to bring about peace and an adjustment of differences, no stranger method to accomplish such a purpose was ever adopted.

The memorandum shed a flood of light upon the intentions of the American Zionist leaders. It placed in serious question all the professions of loyalty to the World Zionist Organization which were made by them.

At the Buffalo convention suggestions by those in disagreement with the tactics of the American Organization that the action proposed by them involved separatism, were rejected as unfounded, and the statement was made and reiterated that there was only a question of difference in methods of raising funds.

What other interpretation could there be placed upon this action than that the American leaders set up barriers between the World Organization and the American Organization which were insuperable obstacles to peace? Was it not natural to draw the inference that the American leaders did not desire peace with the World Organization but wanted to go their own way and that all these theories were set up as conditions precedent to their co-operating with the World Executive Committee.

Dr. Weizmann came to this country. He was shocked by the memorandum and felt deeply the affront to him, but in the interest of the cause he entered into conference with the American leaders and finally appeared before the National Executive Committee where he presented clearly the entire situation, the necessity for an immediate and united effort by the Zionists of the World to raise the funds required lest our cause be brought into imminent danger. He declined, and properly so, to enter into negotiations with regard to the numerous issues raised in the memorandum which he deemed wholly irrelevant to his visit in America and on which he had no authority to pass judgment. He had come here under instructions to establish the Keren Hayesod and he was willing to confer with the American Zionists in order to have unity of action.

When Dr. Weizmann was before our Executive Committee, he stated that if the difference was merely that of the commingling of funds we could get over that quickly enough. But no sooner had he made that statement than a new and paramount issue arose, that of safeguards for

the funds that were to be sent to the London office. I say to you that this issue of safeguards that was raised and that was spread throughout the length and breadth of the country has brought incalculable and permanent harm to our cause. (Applause.) In the minds of thousands of Jews and in the minds of non-Jews there has been created a suspicion that these men who are charged with the duty of undertaking the work for the creation of the Jewish Homeland, are not worthy of confidence. And I say to you that I wonder how our leaders could have taken upon themselves the responsibility of putting such a serious implication into their language. It makes little difference how many times they disavow any intention of showing a lack of confidence in the leaders of the World Organization. There is no other inference that can be drawn from their statements.

Dr. Weizmann brushed aside the affront that was given him in the shape of the memorandum. He was willing to come to an understanding on the basis of practical work. He agreed to the separation of donations and investments. But as to safeguards, there was nothing else for him to do but to reject it, for in that issue was involved a question of the honor of the World Zionist Organization. For him to admit that the Americans must place safeguards upon the money sent by them to the World Zionist Executive meant to admit a charge that the World Zionist Organization was not worthy of confidence, and I am happy to say that the Zionists of America understood the issue and made a very clear and effective answer. If they did not ask for safeguards when the American Zionist Organization was spending the funds which they were contributing, surely they would not ask for safeguards when Dr. Weizmann took charge of them. (Applause.)

It was the opinion of Dr. Weizmann that the fund could operate in America as it operated elsewhere; that the best result could be obtained by creating one large fund, to be administered in accordance with the understanding arrived at with the Economic Council which is to receive 27 per cent of the Keren Hayesod funds for its enterprises. But since the Americans laid so much stress on the danger of commingling funds, he was willing to take the responsibility of agreeing that the Keren Hayesod in America be a Donation Fund only until the Zionist Congress finally passes upon the matter. It was thought by many that a basis for peace had been arrived at, but the new issue of safeguards for the funds to be expended beyond the present Palestine budget made an impossible situation. In other words the American leaders were to say how the funds raised in America were to be expended by the World Executive. That raised a clear issue of authority, and of honor between the International Zionist Organization and the American Organization.

There were many here who spoke of their efforts at peace making. I cannot say that I was one of the peace makers though I had hoped to the last that peace would be reached. I believe peace is a thing much to be desired, but I believe that the only peace that is worth having is a peace with honor. (Applause.)

Let me read to you the final resolution of our National Executive Committee representing the demands of our Administration:

"The President of the Zionist Organization of America is hereby instructed to proceed in agreement with Dr. Weizmann, as President of the World Zionist Organization, on the basis of the Buffalo Resolution, to

establish in America forthwith the Keren Hayesod Donation Fund. This fund is to be applied exclusively in Palestine by the World Zionist Organization through such instrumentalities as may be agreed upon between the President of the World Zionist Organization and the President of the Zionist Organization of America and under such rules and regulations as the President of the World Zionist Organization and the President of the Zionist Organization of America shall jointly agree upon."

The position taken by the American Organization which is only a constituent part of the World Organization has neither legal nor moral ground. It assumes to dictate how the funds should be expended by the International Organization. If the Americans desired a voice in the expenditure of the funds by the World Organization they should have become a part of the International Executive, and exercised such influence as they could by argument and reason. But to refuse to become a part of the World Zionist Executive, to refuse to share any responsibility in the work of the World Organization as the American leaders did in London, and nevertheless to assume the right to say to the World Executive in what manner the work should be conducted and the funds disbursed is an arrogation of power wholly unwarranted. It means a surrender of the authority of the International Organization and its reduction to a state of impotence. For if the American Organization has that right other Federations surely may do likewise. The supremacy and the integrity of the World Zionist Organization within our movement is paramount, and the masses of the Zionists in this country have given their answer in a manner that indicates how clearly they understand this. They have done it in the only way possible for them, by enthusiastically supporting the Keren Hayesod which Dr. Weizmann established in this country and they have done it in a manner surpassing the expectation of the most optimistic.

This convention will have to decide the issue which is now only an issue between us and our leaders. The issue between the American leaders and the World Organization has for the present been settled by Dr. Weizmann. It is inconceivable that they are willing that Dr. Weizmann and his associates on the Executive shall become subservient to the American leaders, for that is what is meant by safeguards upon the funds raised in America. It means that none of the money shall be expended in Palestine excepting it shall have the approval of the American leaders. To support such a position is to cast doubt and suspicion upon Dr. Weizmann and the other members of the Executive. Are the American Zionists willing to say that Dr. Weizmann and the other leaders of the World movement who obtained the Balfour Declaration, who brought Zionism to San Remo, who built up what we now have in Palestine, who rallied World Jewry to the colors of Zionism, are the American Zionists willing to say that they are not to be trusted in the expenditure of the funds but that only the American leaders who have refused to share the responsibility for the work, who have cut off the funds for continuing the work in Palestine, who have shaken confidence in the leaders of the World Zionist movement, and thus endangered our cause while the Mandate is still in the balance, that these men are to be upheld in preference to the men who have dedicated their lives to our movement? To approve the action of the American leaders spells the destruction of the

World Zionist Organization, the one asset which the Jewry of the World has today. Jewry is sufficiently broken up in fragments, its body is sufficiently shattered without tearing down the one structure that still remains intact, though at the cost of so much struggle, the Zionist Organization.

To make every Federation co-ordinate with the World Zionist Executive means to reduce it to the level of a messenger who shall be at the beck and call of those who for the time being hold the purse strings.

The American leaders say that the World Zionist Organization has spent money foolishly in Palestine, that mistakes have been committed. Let us assume for the sake of argument that this is true—is there an organization that does not commit errors? Was it to be expected that the World Organization, beset on every side by a thousand hardships, insecure in its achievements, unable to proceed because of lack of funds, should meet with nothing but success? I dare say that the American Zionist leaders, beset with no such difficulties, have blundered a great deal more. And yet 100 per cent efficiency was expected, and without it we would fold our hands and say, "Not a stitch of work until your bookkeeping is in order." (Applause.)

I don't underestimate the value of bookkeeping, but I say that if you make the issue bookkeeping and not the building up of Palestine, you may get good books, but no Jewish Homeland.

What Dr. Weizmann stressed is the importance of getting numbers into Palestine. The Jews are outnumbered in Palestine and must be immediately increased if the foundations are to be laid for a Jewish Homeland. Dr. Nordau, who is a very wise man (Applause) said at the London Conference that it was essential to get 500,000 Jews into Palestine if the political situation is to be secured. Of course that is impossible, but the underlying idea is there. You know what recently took place in Jaffa. Jewish blood would not have been shed had it not been for the insufficiency of Jewish inhabitants.

I have read the report of Mr. Szold who went to Palestine and prepared a report on reorganization. Mr. Szold is an able man and has presented an interesting document. But I dare say that Mr. Szold could prepare just as interesting a document if he were to investigate the American Zionist Organization. (Applause.)

I have had occasion again and again to speak of the Chaluzim, and no one who has not seen these brave men and women suffering and waiting in the various ports of eastern Europe can have a conception of their enthusiasm and the longing with which they wait to set foot on the soil of Palestine, not that they might be comfortable there but that they might, in the sweat of their brows, help in the building of the Jewish land. (Applause.)

In the border cities of eastern Europe I have seen hundreds of these Chaluzim without homes, without shelter, without provisions, sleeping in stables along the banks of rivers. When they recognize you as an American they follow you through the streets. They kissed my hands—I was not worthy of it—and pleaded with me to help them to get to Palestine. I was so depressed at what I had seen that I wrote to Dr. Weizmann about it, though he knew it perhaps better than I did. His answer was: "I know only too well what they are passing through, and I know even better the tragedy that awaits them in Palestine if work is not provided

for them. I ask you to go to America and tell your American brethren not merely to criticise but to get to work and do something for Palestine." (Applause.)

The Zionist Congress was to take place in August. What harm was there in waiting these few months? The best corporations that you can name can be shown, on close investigation, to have committed errors in some directions. Why did they expect perfection in the Palestinian management?

At the end of 132 years of existence, the American Government, which has the ablest experts at its command, still makes blunders. But who ever heard of a State refusing to pay its taxes unless the National Government will conform to its dictates? And yet this is exactly what the American leaders are proposing to do. The orderly procedure has always been for those dissatisfied with an administration to wait for the proper time, turn it out, and assume the responsibility. If the American leaders feel they understand better the work to be done in Palestine, let them go to the Congress, let them defeat those now in office, and let them do the work with all the trials that it involves.

Mr. Justice Brandeis, whom we all respect and honor, in his address at London, speaking of the necessity of conferring upon the Executive Committee which is to have the responsibility for the work, full power to carry it on, said:

"We must confer it because the task is one of very great difficulty, and the only way of having that task borne, of having men do the thinking and the executing, is to put the burden on them fully. Put that responsibility upon them, and say, 'You have the obligation and you have the opportunity. We look to you for such and such period.' If they were willing to accept the position without such responsibilities, I should be absolutely against accepting them because you can be sure that unless the full responsibility will be imposed upon them, they would not take it, and unless these men are going to take it, they cannot perform this task."

That was what the American leader said at London when he proposed the formation of an Executive Committee. Of course, what he said was in relation to that Executive Committee which he had in mind. But I believe it applies with equal force to any executive committee which was lawfully constituted by the World Zionist Organization. (Applause.) But that part of Mr. Justice Brandeis's statement the American Zionist leaders have forgotten. They have now taken quite a different position. They are perfectly willing to permit Dr. Weizmann and his associates to have the responsibility so long as *they* shall control the funds.

It is true that there were many, and I count myself among them who did not at the time know the exact nature of the Keren Hayesod adopted at London, nor precisely how it would operate. But if our real concern were with improving the plan of the Keren Hayesod so as to make it workable there was a very easy way in which to do that. There was no reason why a conference could not have taken place to frame a proper charter that would meet all objections. But the truth of the matter is that the American leaders were not so much opposed to the Keren Hayesod as to the leadership of the World Executive. We are convinced that the opposition to the Keren Hayesod is merely symptomatic of the antagonism to the World Zionist Organization. I am convinced that the organizers of the Keren Hayesod are only too anxious and willing to

satisfy the American Organization on the matter of legal control of the Keren Hayesod by the World Executive, and that they have at all times been willing to subordinate the Keren Hayesod to the World Zionist Organization. Right here let me bring the following to your attention: When Mr. Naiditch, the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Keren Hayesod, came to America, I said to him: "There has been so much said here that the men in control of the Keren Hayesod want to superimpose themselves upon the World Zionist Organization. Is it possible that the directors of the Keren Hayesod desire to establish themselves as the superiors of the World Zionist Organization?" Mr. Naiditch laughed and said it was absurd; that there never was a time when they were not ready to subordinate themselves to the World Zionist Executive. Then I said to him, "Will you not, in order to satisfy the doubters, send a cable to the directors of the Keren Hayesod, and especially to Jabotinsky who has been pictured as the man in whose brain was hatched the evil scheme to capture the World Zionist Organization, will you not, I asked him, cable to these directors whether they are willing to confer authority upon Dr. Weizmann to make such changes in the statutes of the Keren Hayesod as might be deemed necessary to better secure the control of the Keren Hayesod by the World Zionist Executive?" Mr. Naiditch sent such a cable and just as quickly as the wires could bring back an answer there came the following reply: "Confer unqualified authority. Agree provision amending statutes in such manner as may be deemed necessary to better secure the control of the Keren Hayesod by the International Zionist Organization. (Signed) Jabotinsky Cowen." (Applause.) The other two directors of the Keren Hayesod not having been in London at the time did not sign the cable. But I suppose that no one will question the motives of the other two directors.

When he appeared before our Executive Committee, Dr. Weizmann pointed out the danger of making Diaspora Nationalism an issue. The danger was not to ourselves, but our brethren who are living in the Ukraine, in Hungary, in Poland, in Roumania. There can be no question of the patriotism of American Jews. (Applause.) There is no such issue. And Dr. Weizmann stated to our Executive Committee and here again yesterday, there never was, and there never *will* be any intention on the part of the Zionist Organization to create a political status for Jews in any other place than Palestine. Why then was this issue raised, this issue fraught with danger not to ourselves, for I believe too much in the fundamental spirit of America, but for our brethren abroad? I confess I cannot understand such conduct.

But the saddest thing in all this controversy is that at the very moment when serious dangers have arisen in Palestine and our cause is beset with enemies on all sides, on the eve of the meeting of the League of Nations, when the mandate is to come up for ratification, they in whose hands has been placed the safety of our cause, should have been willing to embarrass the leaders of our movement, and to cause confidence in them to be shaken.

We who are here today as the official representatives of the Zionist Organization of America must say to the American leaders that never, never shall we permit those who have given of their heart's blood for the Jewish cause and who have led it on to victory, to be thus treated; that we respect and honor them for what they have done in the past and that we have confidence that the same ability and devotion which has

brought our movement to the threshold of realization will with our support bring it to final success.

I beg of you do not be influenced by this idea that we are driving men out of the movement. If men who call themselves good and loyal Zionists will be driven out of the Zionist movement because their actions are criticised then I say to you that they do not understand the obligations of a Zionist. (Applause.) There is no question of personalities here.

We have the right to differ with our leaders exactly as they have the right to differ with the men whom they are criticising. The only difference is that we are attempting in an orderly way to bring our criticism for adjudication and they have attempted to impose their will upon the men with whom they differ. We shall abide by the decision of this Convention. They should have abided by the decision of the London Conference.

I say to you do not be afraid of any threats. I hope there will be none made. We heard some in the past. Let us stand by principles and I believe right will triumph. We are all anxious for peace but it will not come because we fail to do our duty. It never comes that way. There is only one way to peace now, and that is to determine this issue clearly and firmly and to disapprove of the course of action which the Administration has pursued. That will be the beginning of peace, the permanent peace that we desire. And I say to you in conclusion that far from doing anything to diminish the leadership and authority of those who are in control of the World Zionist Organization, we say to Dr. Weizmann, we shall strengthen your hands in every possible way so that the all but insupportable burden which you are now carrying may be made lighter and the goal which is before us may be reached the sooner. We pledge our wholehearted support to the work which you have undertaken of rallying the Jews to the Keren Hayesod as the concrete expression of the Jewish will to create the Jewish land. We believe in you, in your ability and in your devotion and we shall stand with you united in the great and solemn task of rebuilding a Jewish Palestine. (Tremendous applause.)

After the conclusion of Mr. Rothenberg's address, the Chairman appointed Mr. Rosenfeld of Dallas, Tex., Sergeant-at-Arms to the Convention. Reverting to the discussion on the report of the Administration, the Chairman asked the Convention whether it desired to hear any of the distinguished visitors before proceeding to a vote. Mr. Lipsky announced that he was authorized to state that neither Dr. Weizmann nor any of his colleagues wished to address the Convention before the report of the Administration had been approved or rejected.

The Chairman recognized Mr. Neumann, who desired to present a resolution with respect to the report of the Administration.

MR. NEUMANN: Mr. Chairman, I have the honor of presenting the following resolution as a substitute resolution which I understand has been offered by Rabbi Wise or others to accept and approve the report, submitted by the President on behalf of the Administration.

RESOLUTION ON THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

"Having received and discussed the report of the President of the Zionist Organization of America, relating to the differences that have arisen between the present administration of the Zionist Organization of

America and the World Zionist Organization, particularly in reference to the Keren Hayesod, and having given careful consideration to the arguments and explanations advanced for and against the position taken in that report, we, the representatives of the Zionist Organization of America, in regular Convention assembled declare,

"THAT while we appreciate to the fullest extent the services rendered to our Cause by the Present Officers of the Administration, we regard it, however, as our duty to state, that the course of action pursued by the present Administration, constituted a breach of the discipline of the Organization, fraught with danger to its integrity, and contrary to the highest interest of the Zionist Movement at this time; and we therefore regretfully express our disapproval thereof."

This resolution having been duly seconded, the chairman accepted this as a substitute to Dr. Wise's resolution, and called upon Dr. Wise to continue the discussion.

RABBI WISE: May I ask a question? Will Mr. Lipsky be good enough to inform me whether it is the understanding that the distinguished visitors are to discuss neither the motion nor the substitute motion.

MR. LIPSKY: Yes.

RABBI WISE: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Weizmann, my fellow Delegates, it may be that I shall prove to be in a minority today. There was a time when my fellow-Zionists thought it not unadmirable on my part to be one of a very small minority of American Jews who were Zionists. I trust that you will understand that I am just as ready to be in a minority as against you, seeing that principles are involved, as you and I have always been ready to be in a minority against those who for a time have seemed to be in the majority. (Applause.) Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I wish first to stress the agreements of all the men and women in this assembly, agreements which are far more important than our disagreements. The first thing upon which we are agreed, we will be together, minority and majority alike, is that the mandate must be ratified and ratified at once. (Applause.)

And our second agreement is that Great Britain must take every step in order to avert a renewal of the Jaffa massacre. (Applause.)

And the third matter upon which we are in agreement is whatever the loss, whatever the hurt, whatever the bloodshed, whatever the martyrdom, even Jaffa is worth while, if it gives us Palestine on the morrow. (Applause). Better a thousand men dying like men and Jews in Jaffa than being killed like dogs by our enemies elsewhere. (Applause).

One further agreement. There is no disagreement between our Dr. Weizmann and ourselves here. We stand with him. We support him. We insist as he does that the gates of Palestine shall be open (applause) shall be opened immediately and shall remain open, (applause). "Thy gates shall remain open continually: they shall not be shut day or night."

So much for our major agreements. There are also minor agreements. We agree in our unswerving, unshakable confidence in the integrity of purpose of the British Government. We honor Great Britain so much that we assume that Palestine is never to become a British Crown Colony. We honor Great Britain so much that we take it for granted that Great Britain will always be ready to deal with whosoever may be named by us as our representative. We will name no man as our representative in

dealing with Great Britain who is unacceptable to Great Britain, but, as a proud and self revering people, we insist upon our right to name our own leaders and not to have them named for us, whether by a European Government or by an American Committee. (Applause.)

We are agreed that there is no conflict between our duties as Zionists and our loyalty as Americans. When, last night a certain statement was made, I know that if we had waited until the end of that statement it is this that we would have heard. We would have heard what any man here might say from platform or from pulpit, namely, that the charges formulated against the Jew by the Dearborn Independent, are false. Does my restatement of Henry Ford's charges against my people involve my acceptance of their validity? In the same way we heard last night how Senator Straus sought to move Samuel Untermyer, a distinguished Jew and American, by the weight of his personal authority, to stamp as false that which you and Senator Straus and I know to be false. That there is conflict or collusion between our duties as Jews and our loyalty as Americans. (Applause.)

Mr. Chairman, up to a few months ago there was peace in Zionist ranks in America. Why has peace suddenly become impossible, unless you agree with my good friend, Rothenberg, that for some reason which not even he can explain, we are suddenly become the enemies, the hurtful, malignant enemies of the leaders of the World Zionist Organization?

When, to use your language, not mine, when did we begin to war the present leadership? Dr. Weizmann, if I may address you, think for a moment of this. Frankfurter was your devoted friend. Mack remains your affectionate well-wisher. Brandeis was your devoted lawyer and loyal coadjutor from the beginning to the end. (Applause and cheers.) There has been it is true a change. What has happened? It is easy to forget. It is easy for you, gentlemen, to treat us, who are in a possible minority, as though we were Zionists of a day, as though we had done little or nothing for the Zionist cause, as if, to quote my old friend Ussischkin; "We had done no more than a Chevra Kadisha Society of Jerusalem during the past year." It is easy to say these things, to indulge in cheap jest. But, after all, if we have done little or nothing for Zionism, why did you year after year ask us to serve you. To serve the cause and to represent you? I will tell you why, though it is hard for me to say this. I do not wish to detract from the honors that rightly sit upon the brow of Dr. Weizmann and yet I must declare publicly that it become a matter of common knowledge, Dr. Weizmann will be the first to admit it when he later speaks, the Balfour Declaration would never have been issued had it not been for the moral prestige and loyal support of Justice Brandeis and his associated American leaders. (Applause.)

The Balfour Declaration and its issuance would have remained a pious hope, had we not been able to move the great leader of the American people of his day, Woodrow Wilson, (Applause), the then president of the United States, to see that we were asking no favor, that the Balfour Declaration was in perfect keeping with the aims of the Allied and Associated Governments. Nor was this all! Ask Weizmann whether or not we helped to secure that hearing at Paris, upon which occasion he acquitted himself with remarkable skill and finest serviceableness to the cause? Ask Weizmann whether we helped in what we were able to do after the riots of Jerusalem, in helping to make the renewal of those riots

impossible. You need not believe me. You may doubt my word. Gentlemen, I speak well within the limits of moderation, when I say we did what we could and we were able to do much, Weizmann imploring that we step into the breach and again bring the mighty power of the American Government and people to bear in that most critical moment.

Again, we were not personally at San Remo and the American Government occupied only a so-called listening post. But ask Weizmann whether or not he was not immensely strengthened, whether his hands were not powerfully supported by what we did, and what we caused to be done in order that there should be gained the moral victory which Weizmann did most to achieve.

I remember that the only or rather the first, question that ever came to me, an American, concerning Weizmann and his great service to the Zionist movement, was when one of his friends on the platform today asked me reproachfully, "Why have you used Dr. Weizmann's name twice in the letter of President Wilson."

Well, to resume after a seeming digression. Why this apparent change in loyalty? I say this seeming change, for there is no change. I think I know the reason. Gentlemen, the war-emergency is over; its days are past, at least that is our belief. We also believe in democracy; that is, in orderly, responsible, lawful government, instead of government by manifesto and ukase. That is the first crime that we committed, namely, that we have insisted for the sake of Zionism and for the sake of Weizmann himself when at times we have deemed it needful to protect, the day of well-considered, democratically ordered Zionist affairs had come.

And what is the next crime that we have committed? We have dared to think; We, the American workers and leaders, have dared to think, and to think ourselves capable of participating in the leadership. America think? Nay, America must give. America is a milch cow. "We do not go to America for judgment, for co-operation, for wisdom, we have come for money and for money alone." (Applause.)

We have been told within a month,—I believe Dr. Weizmann's statement was first given to the Jewish Correspondence Bureau, though it may have been made to one of the Jewish dailies. We were told that the Zionist leaders know nothing, think little, read little. Perhaps that was true in the past. But I wish to say to Dr. Weizmann, as one of his older friends, that if the Zionist leaders thought little, read little, knew nothing, they could have peace with Dr. Weizmann upon his or Rothenberg's terms. But the difficulty is that we have begun to think, only begun to think, that we have begun even to read and to know.

What is the third crime we have committed? Why do Rothenberg and Lipsky and Neumann wish to deny the administration a vote of approval. I will tell you why. Mr. Neumann said it last night, he said that thing though modified it after a moment. "The Administration attitude has been 'Put up or shut up.'" That is a charge unworthy of a Jew, a charge fit to be made only by an enemy of Israel, Israel against Jews, that we have said to our fellow-Jews, "Put up or shut up," that we have used the power of the purse, brutally, tyrannically. There is no other construction. (Turning to Mr. Neumann.) Explain it later if you can. You have said it again and again. Formerly you put it more politely. Last night you revealed to us your inmost mind. You claim that we have abused the power of the purse, that we have done this, that odious and

vile thing, always unworthy of a Jew and least worthy of Jews and serving a great cause, that we have sought brutally, crassly to exercise control through the power of money. Well, what is the fact, or rather what are the facts? There are two implications, two implications and I admit them, though it be to the satisfaction of Mr. Neumann and to all who agree with him. First, we have not exercised the power of the purse, that the power of the purse has meant for us one thing, responsibility, solemn and inescapable. And responsibility has meant two things to us, first, trusteeship, and second, if I may be permitted to use that term which Mr. Rothenberg today put under the ban, "necessary and inevitable safeguards."

We took up the question of safeguards with Dr. Weizmann when he came to America. Dr. Weizmann is wise enough and knows enough to admit that he and I are not the two greatest financiers in the world. I am sure I am not one of them. I believe that Dr. Weizmann thinks he is not. When the question of financial management of great affairs came up, Weizmann at once interjected, "Brandeis is not a great financial authority." I pointed out to Weizmann what he ought to have known, what I believe he will yet know, that Brandeis is not only one of the greatest jurists of America, but he is one of the outstanding experts in railroad and financial and fiscal problems throughout the world. (Applause). But then Weizmann's further answer was: Yes, finance in Palestine is not finance in America. There lies the trouble. Do you really think, Dr. Weizmann, that finance in Palestine is not finance in America? In America two and two make four. What do they make in Palestine? In America two minus two equals zero. In America two minus three means a deficit. I do not know what it means in Palestine, whether deficit or balance. I was not in Palestine long enough to learn those new and unique methods of finance, which are said to be so fundamentally different from financial methods in America.

What do we mean by safeguards. I will tell you what we mean, and we know that Weizmann must mean and desire the same thing. We do not claim that we are the only ones that care about safeguards, but you must remember that up to the time Weizmann came to America, we raised the money, we gathered the funds, Levin helping for a time and Mossinsohn helping for a time, but after all it is not too much to say that Mack, Silver and I together secured one-half to three-fourths of the money raised in America during the last five years for the Zionist cause. (Applause).

Now that Dr. Weizmann has come to the Jewish people of America and has asked for and accepted their funds, he will be just as solicitous as we are about safeguards. What, I repeat, does the word safeguard mean? It means that every dollar given for Palestine shall buy one hundred cents worth for Palestine. Shall we be put in *Cherem*, in ban, because we insist that we are trustees, because we demand safeguards in dealing with money which comes from the savings of the people for the saving of a people? (Applause).

Do we not do honor to our leader when we insist that he must, even as he wills to, accept these safeguards? That is all, dear friends. That is what *Geschaefte Zionismus* means!

Yesterday, when Judge Mack or possibly one of our visitors used the word "business in Palestine," you laughed as scornfully as though we

meant to make business of Palestine, as we were making something for ourselves, as though we wished to profit, as though we wanted to be Palestine profiteers. I say to you, whether Weizmann accepts it, or Ussischkin, or Levin, or Mossinsohn or Naiditch, *Geschaefte Zionismus* is a cheap, yea, contemptibly cheap, anti-Jewish slogan. (Applause.) We are constantly told that we have lost faith in the people. Have we in truth lost faith and confidence in the people, because we hold every day what Dr. Levine beautifully said yesterday, that the upbuilding of Palestine is "a holy thing," *Eine Heilige Sachs* and everything connected with it, and everything that touches it, everything that approaches that shrine must be holy. Do you know, I will tell you who respects the people. They who have such confidence in the judgment and in the good sense of the people, that they are prepared to tell them the whole truth, not weaving around them a spell of illusions, but helping them to place their feet upon the rock-bottom of fundamental business integrity.

But the real objection is not to safeguards. No, not to safeguards! It is not the safeguards, but the safeguardians that are objected to.

Gentlemen, Levin rendered great service for twenty-five years in the Zionist movement. So did Ussischkin. You will incidentally forgive me saying that it was easier to be a Zionist in 1898 in Warsaw than for me to have founded the American Zionist Federation in New York as a youth of 24 in 1898. (Applause.) I do not compare my achievements, poor and humble as they are, with those of Levin. With those of Ussischkin, with those of Mossinsohn, with those of Naiditch and least of all with Weizmann, who, I know, next to Theodor Herzl, will go in Jewish history as the man who did most for the securing of the possibility of Palestine as the Jewish Homeland. (Applause.) I do not compare myself, my service, such as it has been, with the supreme service of Weizmann, but *what* I have said and what I will say and what I am about to say now, whether you like it or whether you do not like it. (You approved of me when I spoke what was in your mind against the anti-Zionists. You shall listen to me when I speak what is in my mind to you, my fellow-Zionists.) A man may have been a great propagandist. A man may have been a great leader in the Zionist cause for five, or ten or twenty years, and yet the fact that a man is a first-rate propagandist like Levin or a fifth-rate propagandist like myself, does not qualify either Levin or myself for the management of the affairs of a people, struggling against and amidst infinite difficulties, for the building up of their life in the ancient Jewish Homeland. A man may be a great *maggid* but a poor administrator. A man may be a good *chasan* and a wretched statesman. The genius of a man for one form of service does not qualify him for State-building. I say that we have the right to chose our men. What would you say if I were to turn to you and declare "From 1898 to 1921, I gave the cause a part of my life and my strength; now I demand, for you owe it to me,—that you shall send me to Palestine as one of the Zionist Commission or I shall be placed next to Ussischkin as Vice-Chairman." Let me say this—

FISHMAN: Why don't you go.

RABBI WISE: I will go to Palestine whenever I can go there and feel that I can serve Palestine without being assassinated. (Applause.) I mean morally assassinated. I am willing to face physical assassination. I will go to Palestine tomorrow, if I can be useful, but I am not going to

go to Palestine and have my report on Palestine condemned before I reach Palestine. Do you understand, Fishman. We have a right to choose our mean afresh.

May I lay down a principle by which we must be governed? Zionism has no debts to pay to any Zionist. (Applause.) Weizmann, statesman as he is, would be the first to say that for the Jewish people. The Jewish people, Zionism, has no debts to pay, not even a debt of gratitude. Gratitude we give to *Goyem*. To ourselves we give only one thing, the privilege of continuing service if our fellow Zionists believe us qualified to serve. We have been told a great deal about loyalty, loyalty to London, loyalty to Zionist World Organization. There is such a thing as loyalty to London and we have been loyal. Weizmann, until after the London Conference and if I am mistaken, he will contradict me and I will stand corrected, Weizmann never asked aid of the American Zionist Organization which we failed to give him, morally or materially. But after all, friends, and I merely anticipate Weizmann, loyalty to London is much, but my loyalty, my Zionist loyalty is to Zionism. (Applause.) My loyalty is to Zionism and then to London as long as London is lawful and obedient to the laws of the World Zionist Organization. Dr. Weizmann, Ussischkin, Levin they put loyalty to Zionism far above loyalty to Theodore Herzl. Mindful of all that Weizmann has done and, I pray God, may do, I put Zionism first and Weizmann second. (Applause.) This is a serious count in the indictment of our associates and ourselves.

Another indictment against our associates and ourselves is that we have been undisciplined. We have not been the undisciplined ones. It is you who have been undisciplined. You have been lawless. You committed the first great breach against the integrity of the World Zionist Organization when in absolute contravention of and disobedience to the London Conference and its divine directions, you permitted Jabotinsky to force his way into the London Executive. You Dr. Weizmann, did not believe it should be done. You, Dr. Weizmann, knew it was unwise. You, Dr. Weizmann, knew it should not have been done. You, Dr. Weizmann, knew it was a lawless and an undisciplined thing to do. Why was it done? Why? Because the want of a sense of discipline, because the spirit of indiscipline yields to any and every pressure, provided the pressure is sufficiently strong, whether the pressure be put in Palestine by Ussischkin or by Jabotinsky in London or by Levin in New York. We demand discipline even of the President of the World Zionist Organization (applause.) And remember, gentlemen, remember that the greatest, gravest indiscipline is the discipline of executive usurpation.

I know I have been misunderstood. I will take the risk. You will misunderstand me, but I say, speaking not perhaps for the mass meetings that have been held in America during the last four weeks, but speaking for the great mass of Jews in America and perhaps for the Jews of England and France and other European lands as well, that the question between us in large part is this,—shall Palestine be added to the lands of the Diaspora or shall Palestine enrich and ennoble the Diaspora? That is the real question between us. There is no conflict. There is no conflict between the East and the West, between East European Jews and West European Jews. What unfairer and unjust thing could be done than to raise this false and confusing issue? I know that Palestine is not

to be Americanized. I know that quite as well as you. Zionism is not for the sake of Americanizing Palestine. But neither is Zionism to Russify, to Russianize, Palestine. (Applause) Palestine is to be neither New York nor Cleveland nor Warsaw nor Pinsk. Palestine is to be Jewish and not American, Jewish and not Russian, Jewish and not Polish, Palestine is to be Jewish and Jewish and only Jewish. (Applause.) That is the issue between us.

Gentlemen, when you vote after a moment, remember there can be no defeat for Justice Brandeis, for Judge Mack, for Nathan Straus, for Dr. Friedenwald, for Felix Frankfurter, for myself. If we asked something ourselves, if we asked even for so unsalable a thing as honor or honors for ourselves, you might defeat us. But when men wish nothing for themselves and everything for a great and impersonal cause they cannot be defeated.

In 1775, following the precedent of a speaker of last night there was a little difference and there was a temporary set-back for the American revolutionists. There was a further difference between the two great English speaking peoples and England was hurt and we were frightened at the outcome of that conflict. But Wendell Phillips said 100 years later Bunker Hill was not a defeat but a skirmish. Gentlemen we cannot be defeated. You may say to us, as I believe you will, "We deny you the right to represent us after this day or tomorrow." Remember, gentlemen, our concern is not with our offices nor with our honors but with Palestine, its present and its future.

Rothenberg hoped that there would be no threats. I do not know whether he meant there should be an exodus without threats or threats without an exodus. We do not threaten, for we are men and not children. We do not threaten for one ancient reason. Dr. Weizmann, Mr. Chairman, we are Zionists and Zionists we are to remain. (Applause.) And we will never withdraw from the American Zionist Organization. Never. (Applause and Cheers.)

When the convention is over, if you so will, we shall return to private life and the leadership will have passed into other hands. If it does, as I believe it will, and when it does, may the next leaders serve more effectively. They cannot serve more faithfully, than have served Mack and Brandeis. (Applause.) If you will it, we can return to private life, remaining of course loyal, helpful, co-operating, eager Zionists. But we can afford to wait. You may not justify us, but "There is a world elsewhere". Without repining, without bitterness, without revolt, we shall await the day of vindication which will come. Until that day, the Lord Judge between thee and us. Amen. (Great applause and cheers.)

A number of motions relative to adjournment were made and defeated. The floor was finally given to Mr. Abraham Goldberg. (Tremendous applause.)

MR. GOLDBERG: (In Yiddish.)

Mr. President and Fellow-delegates: Let me assure you at the very outset that it is not my intention to adopt the practice of my friends on both sides and weary you with vast quantities of documents and reports. I am convinced that we shall not cross to Palestine on this bridge of paper. And I would also like to state, here at the outset, that I hold in respect all the members of the administration, that I esteem them and

honor them. Some of them, if I may state it, hold a very high place in my affections—others hold places a little lower—and others have hardly any place there at all. I make this prefatory statement in order that later, when I mention the name of Mack or of Wise, I may not be obliged to launch into love-declarations meaningless in reality.

We have not come here for the purpose of criticizing Judge Mack or Dr. Wise personally. We are here only to criticize their record as members of the administration. And all of us are good Americans. During the fight we do not spare one another; but when victory will be ours the members of the present administration will be the first to offer congratulations to the newly-elected administration. Could any fight have been bitterer than the fight between the partisans of Wilson and the partisans of Harding? And yet, no sooner was it known that Harding had been elected than the wires were carrying winged greetings from Wilson to Harding. Beautiful! I am not a born American: but all of us strive to assimilate whatever is finest in America. And I am certain that in our particular instance we will act like Americans. Winners or losers, we remain friends and good Zionists.

I pass now to the main subject. Our president has just submitted the report of his activities and, in particular, of his negotiations with the Zionist delegation with regard to the Keren Hayesod. The report contains, *en passant*, a picture of the founders of the Keren Hayesod. Would you care to know the impression which the report produced on me? It is a hard thing to say and yet it is the truth. I was reminded of Ford's Protocols of the Elders of Zion. The report makes allusion to a group of conspirators who are out to capture the Zionist Organization and become its masters—and indirectly it is implied that their purpose is to destroy the World Organization. How one can destroy a thing and at the same time remain its master is not easily understood, but Ford's Protocols, too, are not free from contradictions. The report tells further how the group of conspirators abducted the Prince (the Prince being none other than the President of the World Organization) and how the unhappy Prince struggles, in vain, to escape from his brutal captors . . . unhappy Prince! One cannot but weep at his fate . . . But why this laughter? This is not a matter for mirth. You will find it, black on white, in the report. And who are the brutal captors? Yesterday we heard the declaration of our fellow-Zionist, Judge Mack. Not by a hair's breadth does he doubt the honesty of Ussischkin. Isn't that good enough? And he was eloquent in praise of the heroism and sincerity of Jabotinsky. Excellent! But the question is, why are not these phrases regarding the honesty of Ussischkin and the sincerity of Jabotinsky to be found in the report which speaks of them with such severity? The report should have been the place for these encomiums. The report, however, is something printed, and will be read by men and women who are unacquainted with the founders of the Keren Hayesod. What will these men and women think? A fund of a hundred million, a struggle for control, the use of questionable methods,—and the picture is complete. Jews got wind of money—need anything more be said? Look at the difference:

We have submitted a resolution demanding the rejection of the report, demanding that the administration be censured for its sins of the last months, and yet simultaneously with this resolution, we expressed our appreciation of the good work done for our movement by the administra-

tion. We have inserted the words "to the fullest extent"—to the limit. If, in the last six months, the administration has indeed been productive of some good, let it be mentioned to its credit. This is our way of doing things.

The matter goes much deeper. The report is in its entirety an indictment of the leaders of the World Organization. Those leaders cannot be brought before this bar for judgment. This is not the place to pronounce judgment on them, if judgment is to be pronounced. The Congress is the place for that, and there, if it be deemed proper, they will be called to account. Here and now our business is our own administration. This is a convention of American Zionists, and I put the question, what has our administration done for Zionism, for our great ideal, within the nine months that have elapsed since San Remo, since the appointment of Samuel? What have we done, I ask. The answer is no secret. The delegates know it well, and the delegates will bear in mind, when the vote is taken on the resolution, that since London our administration has done nothing, absolutely nothing, in this, the most earnest moment of our movement. To London it came at least with a program which I, by the way, heartily supported.

They said that the time had come to draw into the work the entire Jewish people: we were not to ask Jews who were willing to help whether or not they agreed with the principles of Zionism. The great thing was to get their help for the establishment of Erez Israel. They said that the time had come to draw into the work all great and able Jews, that we needed now the most important experts. They said that the time demanded the transfer to Palestine, as far as possible, of all our institutions. Palestine was to become the center of all activity.

This program, the London program, contains many good points—had they only been properly interpreted, and had we only done something towards its realization. But this was not the case.

On our return, instead of beginning with a gigantic effort to draw all Jews into the work, we began by alienating from the movement the Zionists themselves.

Instead of creating outside the Zionist Organization a Palestine organization for all Jewry, an organization with a single program, Erez Israel, we began to devitalize our idea, to extinguish the last sparks of living inspiration, declaring that Zionists were withdrawing from their national stand, declarations which were senseless and criminal. Zionists are not cheap opportunists, ready to deny their faith for a little success.

In reality our memorandum theory on nationalism was nothing more nor less than a false interpretation of the idea that the time was come for all Jews to take part in our work irrespective of their attitude towards our program.

Instead of making every effort to draw experts and important individuals into the work, we began by speaking lightly of our own activities and of our own achievements. Whatever we had done was valueless—could not have been worse. Our very members were superannuated candidates for the poorhouse, exhibitions of incapacity and ineptitude. This was the ungenerous and catastrophic criticism which was absolutely irrelevant to the task of attracting experts and prominent men.

I state here and now that it is possible to attract new forces. But the will must be there. In Buffalo we received a letter, a long letter, from

the Reform Rabbis. They offered to co-operate with us. Have we even sent them a single invitation? No! A letter was also received from the B'nei Brith, a very friendly letter. These people wanted to help us. Did we take advantage of their offer? No! We never drew in the classes: but we succeeded in alienating the masses.

It is a plain fact that during this period the administration did not draw into the work a single individual; either because it would not or because it could not; or for both reasons. But the unhappy fact remains: not a single important Jew of the upper classes has been drawn into the work.

It suffices to look through the list of the American Jewish Committee, of the Joint Distribution, of the Chautauqua, of the B'nei Brith, or even of the directory of Dr. Benderly's corporation, to be convinced of the fact that no one was drawn into the work.

And yet, during this interval, the movement was big with events of such magnitude that the attraction of new workers should have been an easy matter. But not so for our administration: it lacked the good-will, it lacked the finesse, and the attractiveness. It is painful to have to say this, but it is the truth. Our friends of the administration are too cold, too condescending, too hard, too self-satisfied to possess attractiveness. And without enthusiasm, without passion, there is no fusion, and elements remain disunited.

Is it not a fact that in the beginning the rank and file received you leaders with wild enthusiasm, ready to cheer you in and out of season? They cheered you till they were hoarse with cheering. Zionists are a grateful and a humble class. They received you like princes. We were ready to efface ourselves. We were nothing—you everything. You were the crown of our glory, you were our glory itself. On you all honor was lavished. We were hewers of wood and drawers of water, and we did not complain of our lot. We elected comrade Mack President of the Zionist Organization, President of the Jewish Congress, and President of the delegation to Paris. Everything there was to give we gave joyfully. And these good folk accepted the honors, but the ice remained unmolten. They remained as heretofore, frigid, distant, sojourning in our midst like aliens, like lost spirits. Their very bearing was that of strangers. They erected an icy barrier around themselves, and one expression was constantly on their lips: "You must act: it is your sacred duty." Ours and not theirs." There was always a sense of distinction between the mand us. And yet we followed them—for such is the nature of the Zionist. They were always in the place of honor, but there was no love for these leaders. How could there be? They left no room for emotion. It froze to death in the icy atmosphere that breathed from them.

At a given moment the Jewish masses suddenly rushed into the arms of the movement. They came to us by the thousands. But they retreated as hastily as they had come, and more hastily. The administration lacked the ability to hold them. With its chilly reception it rebuffed every friend, and with its "categorical imperative" raised up enemies against us.

And so it has come to pass that, at the very time when their land was returned to the Jews, when, through the efforts of the Organization, the greatest victory in the history of the people had been achieved, the people itself stands outside the organization and that solely for the sins of the administration. Our membership has dwindled to a minimum, and our influence been reduced to a shadow.

Let us confess the truth. Now is the time for it. The American Zionist administration has lost faith in the Jewish masses, it has lost the path that leads to the heart of the people. This happened not at the present moment, with the visit of Dr. Weizmann and his commission, but long before.

See for yourselves: since the London Conference the Zionist administration has undertaken nothing for Palestine. It has, on the contrary, been guilty of criminal neglect towards our work and our country at the most critical moment. It is not a tragedy that a great and wealthy country like America should have given us more than a few tens of thousands of dollars a month to the upbuilding of Palestine? And the sorriest feature of it is that the administration, instead of being covered with shame, makes a boast of the fact. The most insignificant institution in any great city raises more funds than the great Jewry of America has contributed to the whole of Palestine in the last nine months. The Immigrant Aid Society has raised more. And whose is the fault if not the administration's? The people didn't give simply because the leaders had lost faith in the people.

There was a brief period, some time before the Jewish Congress, when those who stand at the head of the movement followed our advice: and the movement flourished. The membership grew and Jews gave generously, and would have given more generously still if the leaders had not suddenly entered on a career of destruction, tearing down with one hand what the other hand had erected.

During recent months the administration has abandoned all building and has merely destroyed. They have in effect done the Zionist movement to death by choking the spirit out of it. Propaganda was abandoned, and with it, every effort to rouse the people. In fact, the members of the administration began to argue that the movement was no longer necessary. All that was necessary was money, and, money once provided, every problem would be automatically solved. And in support of this plan new theories were evolved. The stand was taken, to all appearances, that the time had come for all Jews to take part in the movement, but the appeal to all Jews was never launched. And gradually all life was squeezed out of the Zionist movement.

And the inevitable results followed. With the last agonies of the Zionist spirit came the cessation of funds. The lean years set in for Zionism. The administration, instead of recognizing in these symptoms the well merited punishment for its evil deeds, actually read in them the vindication of its false theory that the Jewish masses are incapable of building up Palestine.

For, after all, this is the main argument of the memorandum. The masses are played out. There is no need of a movement. The unity of the Jewish people is a superfluity. The great thing is method and system. As President Mack openly declared yesterday: "It is not a question of good or of bad. It is a question of method." Again the same argument. The great thing is bookkeeping. I am not a bookkeeper, the Lord be thanked. I know that bookkeeping is a necessary thing. But it is certainly not the principal thing. Method is certainly something, but the most important thing is content. I believe I am stating nothing new. Had our friends of the administration made an effort to understand the Jewish spirit, they would not have raised so much dust over the question of method. Our sages have said: "Not argument is the chief thing, but

deeds." "Look not at the form, but at the content" and much more of the like.

But our dear friends of the administration have never considered it necessary to confer with the other members of the executive, who, for all they were content to remain in obscurity, accepting the rôles of laborers, might still have been credited with some knowledge of the movement, some comprehension of the national psychology, an appreciation of things permissible and things unpermissible. Our dear friends of the administration never found occasion to consult anyone whomsoever. Who and what were we, the plebs, whose only right and privilege was interminable labor for the movement?

And yet I can assure you that we could have rendered valuable aid to the leaders had they only thought it proper to consult with us, had they only followed the example of all reasonable administrations instead of usurping all privileges. Our dear friend Dr. Wise has declared that the executive of the World Organization is a body of usurpers. It is possible. It is not my intention to enter on a defense here, but why did not Dr. Wise offer an explanation of the usurpation practised for years by the administration in this country? He himself has been a sufferer.

Let me offer several examples.

We recently had an important guest among us, a political personality who is at the same time a learned Jew, a passionate Zionist, and a splendid man—Dr. Zwi Hirsch Chayas. Dr. Chayas is a source of inspiration wherever he comes. Although born in Galicia he has the greatest influence in Italy, where on more than one occasion he has been received by the King. When he arrived amongst us did our dear administration pay any attention to his presence? Was he even given the opportunity to make the acquaintance of the Zionists? Did our Zionist leaders make any attempt to make his acquaintance? Dr. Levin and Mr. Brainin, the two Zionist veterans, called Dr. Chayas "Rabbenu"—our teacher. I do believe that our Zionist leaders could have taken one or two lessons from him. But they thought otherwise. At the close of the visit, the evening before his departure, a kind of celebration was arranged for the visitor, and even then the administration kept aloof, with the sole exception of the chairman: his presence, presumably, covered the multitude of sins.

How did this come to pass? I can conceive that they did not know who Dr. Chayas was. That can easily happen. But had they only consulted those whom it was their business to consult as equals from time to time, they would soon have found out. Our President, Judge Mack, did not consider it necessary. No advantage was taken of the visit of Dr. Chayas. But Chayas formed his own opinion of our Zionist leaders. There has been mention several times of the *New Maccabean*. I am grateful for the free advertisement. You may well obtain a *New Maccabean* if you have not done so yet. There you will find expressed Dr. Chayas' opinion of our American leaders, and a number of other home truths.

There was another guest amongst us—a distinguished guest, a power among the powers, a millionaire among millionaires, and at the same time a Zionist among Zionists. I mean Major James Rothschild. He came here unexpectedly. His coming here is not to be put to the credit of the administration. What was the outcome of his visit?

During his stay he visited a number of wealthy Jews, and found the majority of them friendly. Most of them promised to be of assistance if

only a practical plan were submitted. But our administration made no attempt to win over these individuals and subsequently, when Rothschild left, the whole affair came to nothing. The administration naturally limited to its own half dozen individuals all the celebration held in honor of the guest, and God forbid that anyone of the plebs should penetrate into the Holy of Holies. The executive was prevented from doing anything, the half-dozen privileged were incapable of doing anything, and the result was that the visit came to naught. And in this no blame can be attached to the Major.

I have had, as you are probably aware, very little contact with millionaires, and yet I dare claim that had Mack and his fellow-administrators conferred with us as to the best method of taking advantage of Rothschild's visit, we could have given them valuable advice.

The visit of Rothschild could have been used for the creation of high enthusiasm amongst the Jewish masses in this country. Rothschild himself would certainly have preferred meeting the people to eating a couple of luncheons in the company of the wealthy. It is no novelty for Rothschild to lunch with a millionaire. But it would have been a novelty for him to learn how the Jewish masses are prepared to honor him who is worthy of honor. For this the opportunity was never granted him.

As a matter of fact, the Jewish masses resented bitterly the fact that no opportunity was given them to see and hear their Rothschild. And wherever I went they never ceased to ask me, with their characteristically friendly irony: "Look you, now that the Lord has been gracious unto us and sent amongst us the son of a peer, a multimillionaire who is a Zionist, one of our own Rothschild's, why is it not granted us to glimpse even the tip of his nose?"

And I ask the same question. Rothschild himself was not to blame in this. When a Hebrew Association came and asked him to speak on the East Side, he accepted. The Jewish masses received him joyfully, and accompanied his automobile to cheer him. He himself thought it well, after his speech, to go in to the club rooms of the Second Zionist District, and say a few words in those close and dusty rooms. Rothschild knew what was fitting and proper. The administration did not. It needs no diplomat to tell you that had Rothschild been brought face to face with the Jewish masses, and advised them to support Zionism, results would have followed. If Zionism is backed by a Rothschild, it must be a certainty.

Why, then, I ask, did not our friends of the administration make the proper use of Rothschild? And if they did not see to what use to put him, why did they not confer with us? The question is an old one. And the answer is that people with the best intentions are not always the best leaders of a movement.

We are constantly reminded of the peaceful Buffalo convention. It is true that at Buffalo there was no opposition. That is to say, that no one created opposition. There were many opponents, but all of them remained quietly in the background. There was a reason for this. We argued: "Let us see how things will turn out. These people submitted a program to the London Conference. Well and good. They must be given an opportunity to carry out their program."

At that convention the great tribune of the movement, Dr. Stephen Wise, a man beloved of the public (even today all of us rose, left and

right, when he was introduced) uttered a powerful eulogy of Brandeis and the administration, but the tragi-comedy of it was that the administration, in its tactlessness, had all but succeeded in alienating this excellent man, and only the influence of third parties had kept him within the fold. I will make a challenge here. Let Dr. Wise make public his correspondence of that period and we shall see who were the ones to invite him to turn to us and work with us again: were we the ones, we who now indict him, or were they the friends he is now defending. I challenge him here to tell us openly if I am not in the right. We were the ones that wrote to him: we did not want to lose him. But why was he forced to resign. Simply because the administration does not even know how to hold the loyalty of its own members.

I return to the Buffalo Convention. It appears now that the administration regarded the Buffalo Convention as a ratification by the Zionist Organization of all its activities, and it was only after the convention that it began its headlong career. And nothing was done without a fanfare of trumpets and a gesture of lordly pride.

It was after Buffalo that they founded the unfortunate Palestine Department, but into that department was not coopted a single individual who had been in Palestine and had studied conditions at first hand. What need of coopting anybody? Was not the administration omniscient and omnipotent?

A standing committee was formed, also a Committee on Palestine. Who, I ask, was the chairman of that committee? A Jew barely acquainted with the very alphabet of Zionism, a man who had never set eyes on Palestine, and who never intends to set eyes on it. This man became chairman by the grace of Mack—for he was one of the coterie. But why should this be so? The upshot of it was that the Standing Committee lived up to its name and remained standing. It did not budge an inch.

After Buffalo the Zionist Organization was liquidated—but even in this no one was consulted. Institutions which for years had been standing solidly on their own foundations, were ruthlessly wrecked. These men did not need to consult any one. They knew everything and understood everything. And above all—this is a bitter thing to say and yet the truth—and above all they understood that nothing but contempt was meet for the old Zionists, the mouthpiece of the movement and of the people, the sources of enthusiasm and propaganda.

The memorandum—a scroll of lamentations—was issued after consultation with no one but the few illuminati. The executive had not the time to study the document, let alone form an opinion. There was no consultation with the members of the executive. What purpose could that serve?

Dr. Wise and others would have it that the entire split in the American party is simply a quarrel between the European and the American leaders. But this is by no means accurate. All of us have accounts to settle with our leaders. Even measured by their own standards they fall short. They themselves provided us with a formula. "Men, money and discipline," and that formula we apply in judgment.

"Men." Our administration has not only failed to draw men into the work: it has even driven some from the work. This is the sum total of its achievements. Even while it ruled under the name of the Provisional Committee it drove from the fold the Mizrachi, the Poale Zion, and later the Order Sons of Zion, bodies which at the time of the Congress accepted our leadership. These it has driven out: it has drawn no one in.

"Money." Our administration has made less of a showing in the raising of money than "The People's Relief." In times pregnant with greatness, the days of San Remo, of the Jewish Commissioner, of the Chaluzim we sent to Palestine, the miserable sum of twenty-five thousand dollars a month. And with it excellent advice: "Stop the immigration."

"Discipline." Under this heading, too, the sins of the administration have been grave and numerous. It transpired that by "discipline" the administration understood the discipline of others at the command of the administration. It did not conceive itself to be similarly obligated. Its attitude of late, since the arrival of Dr. Weizmann at the head of the Zionist Commission is a great breach of discipline. The memorandum, the reception, the negotiations, the campaign of abuse down to the shameful advertisements in the newspapers—all these were grave breaches of Discipline.

I have just mentioned the Zionist Commission. The conduct of the administration since the arrival of the Commission is a chapter in itself, well worth our examination. It throws a good deal of light on the character of our administration.

After more than twenty years of Zionist activity in this country, the time came at last for a visit by the President of the Zionist World Organization. Herzl had dreamed of a visit to America but neither he nor we were destined to witness the realization of his dream. He died, leaving America unvisited. And after him Wolfson dreamed the same dream, and him too we lost before he could come to us. And at last the great moment arrived. A President of the Zionist World Organization came to visit us—a President who had played a part—and perhaps a leading part—in the achievement of the Balfour declaration, in the decision of San Remo, in the appointment of Sir Herbert Samuel. Surely this was an event in the history of American Jewry. And what kind of a reception did we prepare for the President of the Zionist World Organization, who is also the President of the Jewish Agency and therefore the representative of Jewry? Dr. Wise told us here that he is no fool, and he knows that the name of Weizmann, side by side with the name of Herzl, will gleam in letters of gold on the pages of Jewish history. And of course Wise is not a fool, and understands who Weizmann is. So there came to us the second Herzl—no! there cannot be a second Herzl—there came to us the second to Herzl, and with him came our comrade Menachem Ussischkin, the head of the Zionist Commission. Ussischkin has always had opponents but even his opponents were ready to acknowledge the services he had rendered our ideal and his frank and powerful character. It is difficult to picture a congress without the figure of Ussischkin. His very opponents would be the first to regret his absence. He was only absent once from a Congress, and that congress committed a tremendous blunder, the Uganda blunder, which proved so costly to our movement. With them came Dr. Schmarya Levin, who has already lived in our midst and to whom more than our loyalty and gratitude is due. Levin is the Zionist teacher of our President, such is the oft repeated phrase of Judge Mack. With them came Dr. Ben Zion Mossensohn, the founder of the Palestine Gymnasium. Distinguished guests these, individually and collectively—and they were accompanied by that intellectual colossus, the greatest thinker of these times, Albert Einstein, who came as a Zionist, as the representative of the Hebrew University. And I ask, what reception was prepared for these guests and leaders?

Let me first make a little digression in regard to the attitude of the administration towards the visit of Einstein, something which will further illustrate how little our leaders understand the true spirit of Zionism. It is a matter of record that no sooner did the administration learn that Einstein was prepared to come here as a Zionist together with Weizmann, than it cabled: "For God's sake, come as anything but a Zionist." Do you realize what this means? Let me repeat once more that the intentions of these gentlemen were indubitably of the best. They conceived that if Einstein were to come merely as the man of science, to introduce Zionism later as an indirect and secondary issue, he would be able to do more for the University. But this was a mistake, a false appreciation of values. Much more important to Zionism than a few dollars was the coming of Einstein as a Zionist. His coming at once raised to unaccustomed heights the prestige of our ideal in the eyes of all Americans, Jews and non-Jews. Who knows how many young men and women were drawn into the movement by Einstein's appearance as a Zionist? If his visit has attracted only one young man who will later develop into a Stephen Wise, for instance, I would still consider it a financial success. For after all, if we are talking of business, let us remember that there are peddlers and business men. Business men spend more on advertisement than on merchandise. But our administration in its attitude to Einstein was actuated by the spirit, not of the business man but of the peddler. Had these men understood the spirit of the people, they could not have committed such a blunder.

Fellow-delegates, I ask all of you, have you ever as Zionists lived through moments happier and more thrilling than when you learned that Einstein had come to America as the representative of the Hebrew University? Then learn that it was the aim of the administration to deprive you of that glorious pride and happiness: and if Einstein came freely and openly as a Zionist, and not as furtive carrier of Zionist contraband credit, and thanks are due to Dr. Weizmann, who refused to reckon with the telegrams of the administration, and pursued his own path. And Einstein came. And now I ask, what was the reception prepared for our guests? No sooner was it known that the delegation was coming than the administration set about the preparation of a memorandum, a new declaration of principle, a new credo.

Our protests and requests were thrown to the wind—I mean the protests and requests of the minority, now become the majority. In vain we begged that no memorandum should be issued. "What is the good of a memorandum," we argued, "when these men will be with us so soon, and we will be able to sit down and talk the matter over with them, as man to man and friend to friend?"

We, the minority, believed that the tradition of the oral law, a verbal understanding, was best in this case, although, it is true, some of our leaders are of the Reformed Synagogue, and look suspiciously on the traditions of oral law.

Our objection was that the memorandum undertook to found a new theory and principle, and we had not the material time to make the proper study of it. Let us therefore consign the memorandum to the records for later study—though it might have been more fittingly consigned to the public executioner. No attention was paid to us. The majority followed the instructions of Judge Mack who turned the matter into a personal issue.

And thus it came to pass that when Weizmann arrived with the Commission instead of going out to meet him after the good old custom of Jews with the true Torah and with bread and salt, we greeted him with a new and false Torah, and with stones.

The Jews of New York, however, had totally different views in regard to the Commission. They were determined to do honor to those who merited all honor. And the Jews of New York organized a people's committee, and eight hundred organizations met, determined to prepare for Weizmann a splendid and imposing reception. What was the attitude of our administration towards the Commission?

From the very beginning the administration looked askance at the People's Committee, though in reality it should have been gratified at the welcome prepared for the Commission and at the fact that the Jew in the street, who till that day had remained aloof from us, was now responding to the call of his own accord. Was not this the day for which we had been waiting?

At first the administration took up an offended attitude towards the People's Committee, which at once gave the signal for the formation of similar committees throughout the entire country.

There have not been wanting evil tongues to declare that the administration begrudged the Commission the splendid reception prepared for it by outsiders. The explanation is perhaps malicious, but some explanation must be found for the curious attitude of the administration towards the committee and all its undertakings.

It is a matter of record, for instance, that our administration refused to receive the Commission on the Mayor's boat and to take part in the ceremony conferring the freedom of the city on our guests, on the clever pretext that Mayor Hylan is a sympathizer with Sinn Fein. Since the foundation of New York perhaps one hundred individuals in all have received the freedom of the city—amongst them not a single Jew, though many eminent Jews have come to New York. But our Commission did receive the freedom of the city. The administration took no part in the ceremony, wouldn't pronounce an "Amen" to the blessing because it wasn't on speaking terms with the minister. The "Sinn Fein" pretext threw dust in nobody's eyes. The senselessness of it is palpable. The French envoy, Viviani, was unmoved by the possibilities, only our Zionist leaders were in a sudden horror-stricken by the mayor's private sympathies. Ex-Attorney General Wickersham accepted the invitation to act with the mayor in extending greetings to the commission at the ceremony, which was the most imposing in the history of the City of New York. Our administration was overcome with fear.

It is patent to all eyes that the "Sinn Fein" talk was nothing more than a clumsy pretext. The true reason lay much deeper. Our administration is not the right one for a movement like ours. Perhaps it possesses the right qualities for the direction of a corporation, but these are not the men to take the direction of a national movement. From the very beginning it regarded with displeasure the great fuss made of the Commission.

Need anything more be said? Even the so-called official mass meeting held in the Metropolitan Opera House, not one member of the administration, with the exception of the chairman, was present. The honorary president did not even find it necessary to send his greetings. And this

was the reception accorded by our beloved leaders of these prominent guests from Europe. And on top of all this, the administration did not cease to vociferate that it wanted peace, peace.

And this is by no means all. No sooner had Weizmann arrived than they began negotiations. Judge Mack took with him two secretaries, whose names he did not deem it necessary to disclose. But our worthy comrade Mack did not deem it necessary to take with him even one of those fourteen whose very opposition to the memorandum was proof positive of their anxiety to establish peace with the least possible delay. Why was it that Judge Mack did not invite a single one of these fourteen to attend the negotiations? The fact remains that he did not do so. The fourteen who had dared to have an opinion of their own must be severely punished, and far be it from one of the faithful to fraternize with them.

For eight long days did our friends of the administration carry on negotiations with Weizmann and his commission: and at the end of the eight days how had the situation changed? When the meeting of the Executive was called Judge Mack handed Weizmann an ultimatum couched in the following terms: "If the Executive adopts Weizmann's point of view we resign, from Brandeis down." This ultimatum Weizmann characterized as a loaded pistol directed at his heart. He asked them: "How can you expect me to speak on the Keren Hayesod when at the very outset you state that should I succeed in convincing the Executive, and should the executive adopt my point of view, every single one of you will resign? On no condition would I drive you out of the movement. I certainly would not have it said that I came here with that purpose in mind. Only one thing remains to me: I must state my case for form's sake only, but so weakly, with such lack of conviction that the members of the Executive must remain utterly uninfluenced."

Then came the protest of the members of the Executive who are accused of having embittered the quarrel: they rose in warning against the projected resignations. Here today we are assembled in convention and a change of administration is only natural. But at that time the wholesale resignation of the administration would have been fraught with danger to our movement. Bear well in mind that these men knew that their resignation at such a time might mean a mortal blow to our ideal. Yet their intention was to resign.

One of our partisans warned them there and then in terms too explicit to be misunderstood that if they resigned, if like the false mother, they were prepared from capriciousness or from sheer obstinacy to see the living movement split in twain, then we would declare war to the death, a bitter and merciless war. Curiously enough, no mention of this threat is to be found anywhere in the report. And in the same way we warned them against raising the question of nationalism at a time like this. We told them: "Comrades: leave it alone. You are playing with dynamite. Have events in Poland taught you nothing? Do you know so little of conditions here that now, after more than twenty years of Zionism, when the whole world has recognized our fidelity to the countries in which we live, when President after President and king after king have shown the warmest sympathy with our ideal, and have understood that Zionists are amongst the most faithful citizens of a country, now you should wish to raise the question of nationalism? Surely we that hunger after a country for our people recognize the meaning of country.

Surely we that want a flag for our people know in what esteem a flag should be held. We know and respect the language of every country. And to raise the question of nationalism now is nothing more or less than to place a deadly weapon in the hands of our enemies." But our friends and leaders would not be moved, and yesterday their obstinacy bore its evil and inevitable fruit.

Mr. Straus, Junior, the son of an old and noble father, could draw from their speeches no other conclusion than that we were occupied with vicious anti-American propaganda. This young man is not to be blamed. He simply knows no better. He had heard vague and ominous rumors of Zionists tainted with dangerous nationalism. And now European Zionists have suddenly appeared on the scene. The whole dangerous conspiracy is revealed to him in a flash, there is obviously an anti-American campaign afoot—and it must be stopped.

Gentlemen: (*Speaking to Judge Mack and other representatives of the administration*) This unfortunate young man, who seems to evince some interest in Zionism, was never drawn into the movement by you. You have never been responsible for his attendance at a Zionist meeting. He never came into intimate contact with Zionists and the fault is yours. And when, thanks to Weizmann's visit, he did come to us, it was to find you engaged with the question of nationalism, which was to be rooted out: and of course he came to your assistance. Yesterday this young man met with his punishment. There were stormy scenes. Delegates could not listen calmly to accusations of anti-Americanism. Who could pass such an accusation over in silence? We who have known the lands of oppression, surely we of all people know how to prize America. The delegates were roused to anger. The President of the World Organization, whose every ounce of energy is needed for more valuable purposes, was startled and outraged by this speech. And whose is the guilt in all this? Not the young man's, but the administration's. The administration, the administration alone is guilty, and it cannot even plead that we did not give due warning. And what were the motives behind this policy?

Yesterday we were told by Judge Mack that on page 36 of the *New Maccabean* there is a passage which would rejoice the heart of the anti-Semites, which, once discovered, they would reprint and scatter abroad with a flourish of trumpets.

And last night on returning from the meeting to my room, I began, despite the lateness of the hour—for it was after midnight—to read and reread the offending passage. And after a double perusal I was still unable to perceive even a shadow or glimmer of the alleged blasphemy. I have no intention of entering into a philosophic disquisition on nationalism. It would be out of place here. But one or two observations could not be misplaced. I will then read the passage through in English and we will see what grounds there are for this outcry.

We claim that even when every individual Jew should have a home such as we have found in America, the fact remains that the Jewish people, as such, is still homeless. We believe in the existence of a Jewish people, only because there is a Jewish people is it necessary to have a Jewish home. Were there no Jewish people, there were no need of a Jewish national home. The reform Rabbis recognize only a Jewish congregation, but we know that there is a Jewish people, peculiar among the peoples of the world.

We see no contradiction in our nationalism and our loyalty to the land in which we live. The first springs from our origin, our blood, our culture, tradition, religion and hopes, the other from our duty as citizens (from political recognition), from fidelity to the interests of the country, from readiness to defend the country with our lives in times of danger, even when that defence may force us to face in mortal combat our brothers of the same race. That is the question. In other languages—as for instance in German, we can speak of a Jewish nation, because in that language the word nation has only an ethnic-cultural and not a political connotation. It is otherwise in English. "Nation" in English means the state too, and contains a political implication. In English it is therefore preferable, for the sake of greater clearness, and to avoid all misunderstanding, not to use the word nation. The word "nationality" is better, as Judge Mack once indicated, and that is the word we use.

That is the theory of the matter. I will now read the passage in question: "Their Federalism also implies a denial of national action. It assumes that the Jewish nationality is yet to be created in Palestine. The contention of Zionism since the beginning of the movement has been that the Jewish people, scattered and dispersed, are now, here, a living nationality, which must be provided with a political status and a self-centered economic life."

I ask, where is the contraband in this passage. It is not clear that the writer does not look to the creation of a political status in America, but in Palestine. He says that we are already a living nationality, here, in the Diaspora. What we lack is a political centre, and that centre Zionism will create in Palestine. No other interpretation is possible, and there is not the slightest doubt as to the writer's meaning. It is clear then that there were absolutely no grounds for uneasiness, much less for the clatter that was raised. But our administration would not listen to our warning, and at once sounded the alarm; with the results that we have seen.

We warned the administration to begin at once the work of the Keren Hayesod, to stretch out a brotherly hand to the Commission, and the answer of Judge Mack was that there could be no commingling of funds. And why? The real reason was never given. But that was what they said. And questions are blasphemy. For the sake of peace, Weizmann was ready to give way on the first point. No commingling of funds, if that displeases you. Weizmann made this concession and it was hoped thereby to establish peace. But then we saw that this first demand was only the thin end of the wedge. No sooner was it met than a second demand sprang up in its place: Control, safeguards. What does the phrase mean?

From the war we have inherited the word camouflage, and from our dissensions the word "Safeguard." Cynics say that there is a connection between those two words. The word safeguards was here simply camouflage. It was sought under the covering of this word to bring to realization the ancient dream of the administration, the separation of the American Zionist Organization from the World Organization. Of course it is essential that every nickel contributed to Palestine shall be effectively spent—but why only the American nickel? We must not forget the Russian groschen, the German pfennig and the Austrian heller. Jewish money is Jewish money. But as soon as we establish a distinction between our money, which we must control, and other moneys which can pre-

sumably run to waste, we have struck a blow at the foundations of Jewish unity. No sooner do we demand that we shall be the masters of our own contributions, so as to control thereby the leaders of the World Organization, than we have destroyed all discipline and shamed our leaders. We should all feel grateful to Dr. Weizmann who indignantly rejected the proposition and thereby saved the honor of the World Organization, the honor of Zionism and the honor of all of us.

On top of this let us bear in mind that our friends of the administration placed us in an extremely unworthy light by their very mention of money. We warned them against this as far back as London. Because of the very fact that we can contribute eighty per cent of the money, while our unhappy brothers in Europe can contribute no more than twenty per cent, because of that very fact, I say, we should have been the last to mention the word money. For after all they are contributing more than we. We contribute money: they are giving their blood. We give of our superfluity: they give their daily bread. Even today Poland contributes millions of marks, and it is not the fault of the Jews of Poland that the value of the mark has fallen so low. In the memorandum too the shameful point is made that the Jews of Europe vote while they contribute no money. "Representation without taxation" they call it. Was such a memorandum to be accepted?

And how could the administration talk so shamelessly of "safeguards" when in the last nine months it has collected practically nothing? At the beginning of his speech Dr. Wise demanded that the gates of Palestine be flung wide open. But does not Dr. Wise know that the reason for closing the gates was that we had failed to send money to Palestine? It is heartbreaking to have to say this—but it is the truth. Had we sent enough money to Palestine the pogrom would never have taken place. We ourselves are not all guiltless of this blood. For nine long months has the Jewish Commissioner in Palestine been waiting for help from the Zionists of America. What have we done? Nothing! Absolutely nothing! And then Dr. Weizmann came: so we took to preparing memorandums and to inserting advertisements in the press, advising Jews to refrain from helping the Keren Hayesod. And this was done at a time when the blood of Jewish heroes was being shed in the streets of Jaffa, Petach Tikvah and Cheder. The day will come when our friends of the Administration will beat their breasts and cry "Peccavimus," a day when they will have to render account for their acts, for having inveigled into the chairmanship of a committee whose task it was to hinder the progress of work in Palestine a god-hearted, noble-spirited Jew like Nathan Straus, who is surely no adept in the ingenious legalities to which his name is signed. His pure character, his sincerity was used as a cloak to cover up the shameless crime of the advertisements. And if ever a man will condemn these people it will be Nathan Straus when he will discover to what unworthy uses his name was put and to what ends his goodness and fineness were exploited. But this is not the crux of the matter. The chief thing is to remember that, for the sake of achieving a triumph, the administration thought it proper to drag into their plans a name as stainless as that of Straus: here was a man whose name, as far as memory can go back, has been used only for one public purpose, that of urging Jews and non-Jews alike to contribute to worthy purposes. Here, for the first time, his name was used urging Jews to refrain from giving: and that when

the object of their gifts was Palestine, a time when Palestine is in the greatest need. No punishment could be heavy enough for this misdeed.

Let me recount an episode which took place quite recently. It was while present at a meeting of the last Executive, when our friends of the majority were absorbed in the question of "safeguards" that I received a telephone call from the *Morning Journal*, and was told that a pogrom had taken place in Jaffa, that tens of Jews had been killed and hundreds wounded. I was overwhelmed by the news, shaken to the roots of my being. I called Dr. Wise to one side and told him the dreadful news. I thought then that it would be better to tell it to him, and not to the Executive direct because, coming from him, it would perhaps make a profounder impression, and perhaps his party would realize that this was not a time for dissension. It was Wise, then, who imparted the news. Did it create a profound impression? I must say with regret it did not. A committee was certainly appointed. Our friend Neumann was appointed to that committee and this was deemed sufficient. And immediately a proposition was carried to collect no money for the Jewish University until the "safeguards" had been accorded. As applied to the University their argument was simply nonsense, for we all know that until the next Congress no beginning will be made on the building of the University, and the money would remain here. What sense, then, in asking for safeguards? The minority remained obstinate, for this was Judge Mack's demand. "Safeguards first," let Einstein's visit be a success or a failure, although, God be thanked, Einstein's visit was not a failure. There were other Jews who came to help in the work, and the University will be built—but no thanks will be due to the administration. They did everything in their power to place obstacles in the way. Einstein found the fitting word for their methods. Einstein declared on his departure that our leaders were committing sabotage, and he was right. It was nothing but sabotage. This was their line of action when they received the dreadful news from Jaffa. And what has our administration done towards the prevention of a repetition of those horrible events? Day after day I asked our friend Neumann whether he had been called to a committee meeting. "No," was his answer. "I have not been called." In Warsaw, in Berlin, in London, wherever Jews are found, great meetings were called and a storm of protest was raised. In Poland the National Council passed a resolution demanding that the gates of Palestine be thrown open to Jewish immigration. In every country there was profound emotion. And what did we in America, the great, the wealthy, what did we do to help our land in time of need? Nothing! There was not even a gesture of sympathy. In that time of need we were printing signed advertisements in the Jewish press calling upon Jews not to help Palestine. The time will come when we will be working hand in hand with these men who today we are indicting because we cannot help ourselves. But before that can come to pass they will have to regret what they have done, they will have to beat their breasts and cry "Our hands have shed this blood," for the ink with which these advertisements were signed was redder than blood.

Our friend Wise has told that he and his fellow-administrators helped in the obtaining of the Balfour declaration. We know and admit freely that Wise helped, though his friends have never stated the fact. But the time has come when we must rescue the Balfour declaration from the hands of those that helped in obtaining it. For their recent methods have endangered our entire political success. Our friend Wise has demanded

that we act with discipline, and has stated that the movement is more important than Weizmann. Well said! The statement has my cordial approval. The movement is more important than any individual, and it is for the delegates to bear in mind only the interests of the movement and to vote according to the dictates of their conscience, regardless of whether their vote will wound the pride or honor of any member of the present administration.

Friend Wise remarked that someone told him that even if a man is a good financier in America, it is no proof that he would be a good financier in Palestine. Friend Wise was jesting at the expense of some one who made this observation. He said that the twice two which make four in New York also make four in Jerusalem. A Unit is a Unit the wide world over. . . . Very true, until Einstein proves the contrary. Friend Wise did not tell us with whom the intelligent remark originated. But whoever said it, the word was a good one. I take up its defence. Friend Wise is not so simple as to think that the Nemo who made the remark that a financier in New York was not necessarily a financier in Zion meant that the mathematics of Jerusalem are not the mathematics of New York. His meaning is quite clear. The term financier can be applied to the man who, in this country, understands the control of the finances already in existence. America is a land of riches, a land of gold—would that ours were, too, and the mass to whom Wise alluded is one familiar enough with the control of finances in this country. But finances are non-existent in Palestine. Everything is to be created there, and a good financier for Palestine is one who could create the finances of that country. The financier whom Dr. Wise has in mind is one for America and not for Palestine; he is not a man who can create finances—and the proof of my statement lies in the record of his regime.

Friend Wise has said that it is our wish to found in Palestine a Jewish home: not an American home, but not a Russian home, either. Well said! But the real intent of the remark was to sting. And I ask, whose fault is it if Palestine is Russian? Are the Jews of Russia at fault if the American Jews are not to be found in Palestine? Let the Jews of America and the Jews of all other free countries turn to Palestine, and the result will be a true Jewish community and a true Jewish home. But this is not all. I want to remind friend Wise that so far we are the only ones to have established in Palestine an American Medical Unit. The American Medical Unit is doing excellent work. But why American? Shall we split up our unity in Palestine and be classified as Russian Jews, English Jews, German Jews? When I was in Palestine I was ashamed to see our Zionists of the Unit exhibiting their American uniforms, epaulettes and swords and all. And I asked myself, what childish game is this? I raised the question in London, and there we were promised that the American Medical Unit would pass into a Zionist Medical Unit. But the promise remains a promise until this day.

Friend Wise told us that they were the ones to collect money for Palestine. True enough. But it is equally true that Zionists gave them money only as the representatives of the great Zionist movement in general. But Zionists will not give them any more money: for they are no longer the representatives of Zionism: and perhaps they never really were. There are those who have long been arguing that these men from the first moment of their accession, took Zionism much too simply. Friend Wise

is excepted from that statement, and when I saw Wise's signature to the advertisements, I asked myself: These men lacked the touch which opens a way into the heart of the Zionist ideal. There are those who have long been arguing that these leaders are on the wrong road, that, though they are in the high places of Zionism, they do not understand the full meaning, the content and wonder of the Zionist movement.

Ideals, too, have body and soul, form and content. It cannot be denied that the intentions of these men were of the best, that at all times they sincerely sought the good of Zionism. But this is a question not merely of intention, but of understanding, not of aim, but of trueness of vision.

These men, great as is their rôle in the non-Jewish world, could not take hold of Jewish life, could not grasp Jewish ideals, enter into Jewish martyrdom, Jewish suffering. They could—and perhaps they would not.

It is possible that Zionism found favor in their eyes because in all externals it is so like all other, non-Jewish political movements. Indeed, it seems even to be founded on the principle "The House of Israel is like all the nations," on the similarity of Jews to other peoples.—The nations speak of land, language and flag: and we do likewise.

This side of Zionism, its outward form was the one that captured and held them, and they believed that if they only subscribed to these points they would be Zionists and perhaps could even become leaders. But they were mistaken. This is the shallowest understanding of Zionism. The Zionist feels more deeply than this, and means more earnestly. Like all great ideals Zionism is not as simple as it appears at the first glance. Zionism is compounded of a thesis and a counter thesis: it is the resultant of a force and a counter force.

And yet, in time of war, we Zionists accepted their leadership. It was a time of peril. They, too, took up the cry, "Stand behind the President." Right or wrong, we obeyed. The law of the Gentile was the law of the Jew. We obeyed, even though in the hour of battle these leaders blundered, even though the wiser ones warned them to rouse the full strength of the people lest, in the moment of political victory, they find themselves without the forces to exploit that victory to the full.

Yet Zionists remained silent. The discipline of war bound us hand and foot. And on top of this there was the exaggerated gratitude of Zionists to every new recruit that stepped into the ranks. Even in the ranks of Zionism there is great respect for the Jew still holding aloof.

But this cannot continue. We have no alternative but to make a change. Our present leaders have never fired the imagination of the people, have never touched its heart strings. They were too prosaic. They never understood the people, and the people accepted them without enthusiasm. Our leaders had their advocates, but not their burning zealots, and the masses remained cold, for the appeal was made in chilly language, in phrases that did not come from the living wells of the heart, and could not reach them again.

We have no alternative. The change must be made. The memorandum must be rejected. This is a painful moment, but the fault lies with the administration. The administration is guilty if we must suffer. The movement, the ideal, is above all personalities. This is not the time to take personalities into consideration. Our movement is in danger and must be saved. This is our duty. And not one delegate will turn from his duty. (Tremendous applause.)

At the conclusion of Mr. Goldberg's speech Rabbi Wise, rising to a point of explanation, informed the Convention that he had not been named on the Mayor's Committee for the Reception to the Zionist Commission. Had he been named, he would have gone.

Judge Rosenblatt informed the Convention that George W. Wickersham, former Attorney General of the United States, a Republican, not only served on that Committee, but spoke on behalf of the Mayor. This statement was received with applause.

Mr. Lipsky then moved that the Convention adjourn after the Committee on Committees had rendered its report. This motion was seconded and carried.

Mr. Richards, on behalf of the Committee on Committees then read the report.

MR. RICHARDS:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES.

Rabbi Samuel Benjamin, Chairman.

Samuel Blitz, Secretary.

The Committee unanimously reports as follows:

BUDGET COMMITTEE

(A committee of 15 to consider the budget and all financial questions and present resolutions to the Convention.)

Louis Robison, Chairman; Wm. B. Marker, Chester, Pa.; Benjamin Rabalsky, Boston; I. Willins, Nashua, N. H.; Louis Braines, Perth Amboy, N. J.; David Surdut, New York City; I. Mehl, Ft. Worth, Texas; D. P. Pollack, Chicago, Ill.; Samuel Margolis, Dayton, O.; I. Rude, Denver, Colo.; B. Grabelsky, New York City; Samuel Mackovitz, Marienette, Wis.; A. M. Calmenson, St. Paul, Minn.; Herman Ruwitch, Crystal Falls, Mich.; I. Irving Lipshitz, San Francisco, Cal.

ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

(A committee of 15 on organization to which all resolutions on organization and administration matters should be referred and which should report resolutions on these subjects to the Convention.)

Max Schulman, Chicago, Chairman; Samuel Blitz, New York City; Mrs. I. S. Danziger, New York City; I. Alpert, New York City; Samuel J. Nathanson, New Haven, Conn.; Samuel J. Sagarin, Pittsfield, Mass.; J. J. Drey, Iron City, Mich.; H. Walder, Plainfield, N. J.; H. H. Fisher, Shreveport, L. I.; Oscar Altschuler, Youngstown, O.; Rabbi Moses Baroway, Akron, O.; Samuel Rittenberg, Charleston, S. C.; Henry Eiser, New York City; Rabbi M. M. Eichler, Buffalo, N. Y.; William Sauber, Green Bay, Wis.

KEREN HAYESOD

(A committee of 15 to consider resolutions bearing on the Keren Hayesod, and the methods to be employed for raising this fund.)

Peter J. Schweitzer, Chairman; Aaron Levinstone, Newark, N. J.; Emanuel Neumann, New York City; M. I. Silverman, Norwich, Conn.; A.

Segal, Brockton, Mass.; B. A. Rosenblatt, New York City; Ephraim Lissitzky, New Orleans, La.; Solomon J. Weinstein, New York City; Fred Lubin, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. G. J. Gordon, Minneapolis, Minn.; Sol. Rosenbloom, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mrs. Caroline Greenfield, New York City; Isidore Blum, Baltimore, Md.; Morris Neuman, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Rev. I. H. Levinthal, Brooklyn, N. Y.

CONGRESS COMMITTEE

(A committee of 15 to consider the methods to be employed in the forthcoming Zionist Congress elections and to present resolutions to the Convention.)

Louis Topkis, Wilmington, Del., Chairman; Herman Conheim, New York City; A. M. Heller, Minneapolis, Minn.; Jonas Goldsmith, New Britain, Conn.; M. J. Slonim, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Simon Rothenberg, New York City; J. Promboin, Cambridge, Mass.; Leonard M. Palitz, Savannah, Ga.; I. Teplow, Taunton, Mass.; I. A. Lassers, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. A. S. Wolf, St. Louis, Mo.; Jacob M. Moses, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Emil Crockin, Baltimore, Md.; Louis H. Miller, Buffalo, New York; Julius Meyer, Boston, Mass.

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS

(A committee of 15 to consider all general resolutions submitted by delegates or formulated by it and to present them to the Convention.)

Jacob Fishman, New York, Chairman; Abraham Goldberg, New York; Dr. S. M. Melamed, Chicago; Bernard G. Richards, New York; Abraham Goldstein, Hartford; M. Friedman, Pawtucket; L. Kneeter, Omaha, Neb.; Sol. Hurwitz, Cleveland; Rabbi L. Feinberg, Cincinnati, O.; H. W. Freeman, Houston, Texas; Rabbi A. A. Neumann, Philadelphia; Garfield A. Berlinsky, Baltimore; Mrs. A. H. Vixman, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Rabbi Solomon Goldman, Cleveland; Mrs. Irma Lindheim, New York.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

(A committee of 15 to consider Zionist publications and periodicals and to present resolutions to the Convention.)

Jacob Ginsburg, Philadelphia, Chairman; Morris Margulies, New York City; Senior Abel, New York City; Dr. Leon Spitz, Charleston, S. C.; Rev. M. Freed, Worcester, Mass.; J. Gabriely, Jersey City, N. J.; Israel Wolf, New York City; S. Borowsky, New York City; Rabbi Glazer, Kansas City, Mo.; Samuel Blum, Columbia, S. C.; Max Grant, Providence, R. I.; Alex Leitman, Norfolk, Va.; Mrs. L. Goldring, Buffalo; Julius Max, Sheboygan, Wis.; Mrs. J. Guggenheimer, Lynchburg, Va.

NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

(A committee of 15 on nominations to present the nominations for officers of the Zionist Organization of America and members of the National Executive Committee.)

Isaac Harris, Hartford, Chairman; Reuben Taylor, Hartford, Conn.; Isaac Carmel, Cleveland, Ohio; S. Shamroth, Lynn, Mass.; Harry Kahn,

New York City; H. Steinberg, Chicago, Ill.; M. G. Rosenberg, Tampa, Fla.; Louis Goldring, Buffalo; Mrs. Jacob Sobel, New York City; M. Zeldin, New York City.

BOARD OF ELECTIONS

(A Convention Election Board of nine members, which shall be in charge of the elections to be held at this Convention.)

A. P. Rosenberg, Milwaukee, Chairman; Max Levy, New York City; Philip Alstat, White Plains, N. Y.; Herman Beck, Kingston, N. Y.; Ben Halpern, West Hoboken, N. J.; Alex Wagman, Boston, Mass.; H. L. Silk, Philadelphia, Pa.; L. Charach, Iron Mountain, Mich.; Joseph Freifeld, Aiken, S. C.

The adoption of the report of the Committee on Committees was moved, seconded and carried. The Convention thereupon adjourned at 3:50 p. m.

FOURTH SESSION

HELD AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUILDING, MONDAY, JUNE 6TH.

The Chairman called the Convention to order at 8:30 P. M.

Mr. B. G. Richards informed the Convention that a large number of greetings from important bodies and individuals had been received. Mr. de Haas moved that, in view of the shortage of time these greetings be entered into the records without being read. The motion was seconded and carried. It was decided, however, on the motion of Mr. Richards, that the Convention send its greetings and good wishes to the Independent Order Brith Sholom, which for many years had been a staunch supporter of Zionism.

The Chairman announced that two additional speeches would be made on each side of the issue, after which a vote would be taken. The floor was then given to Mr. Schweitzer.

MR. SCHWEITZER: Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates. I am in a peculiar condition. I am still an officer of the organization, yet I am one of those who have taken a stand against the administration. I have a chance now to explain how I came to be the Treasurer of the Organization, and how I came to take a stand against the administration.

I was elected a delegate to the London Conference of July, 1920. I did not go there, but when I learned what had happened there I became disappointed in our leaders. The position which was taken up by the leader of the American Zionist Organization—it has been agreed not to mention the name—was inexplicable to me. I could not understand how one could on the one hand criticise all the work which had been done by the World Organization officers, and then draw back and say, "No, I will not take any part, I will not take any share of the responsibility." There can be no criticism without a readiness to share the responsibility. Furthermore, in accepting the honorary presidency of the American Zionist Organization, he made it a condition that no American should participate in the World Zionist Organization. This kind of logic is beyond my understanding.

When the delegation returned from London in September, 1920, many of the delegates were highly indignant, and many of those who at that time were taking a stand against our leaders in London have since then changed their position. At the first meeting of the Executive after the return of the delegation, I demanded that two members should be elected without delay to the World Zionist Executive. My motion was not carried, and the situation remained as before. Since then we have remained a part of the World Zionist Organization without any representation on the World Executive. On the one hand we criticise the work done by the World Executive, and on the other hand we refuse to participate in that work.

When our delegation left London there remained a gentleman who is styled in our report as the financial secretary. He was neither our representative nor a member of the Executive Committee. Now I happen to be in possession of some of his correspondence with our President. There are no secrets about these letters, which came to me as Treasurer of the Organization. Until lately I did not pay any attention to these letters, and it did not occur to me that there was any connection between this man and Simon and de Lieme. But this correspondence is important because it throws light on the entire situation. All the accusations, all the insinuations, right or wrong, came through this London Secretary. All the program of the Buffalo Convention, especially in regard to the Keren Hayesod, was outlined by the London Secretary. I refer to the first letter of October 8th. It reads:

"It is possible also that Naiditch and Slotopolsky will come to America to see what they can do with rich individual Jews, particularly the Russians. If they come, it will be with the strict understanding that they are not to engage in general organization matters which are to be left entirely with Weizmann and the American Organization. The attitude of Simon and de Lieme is quite unequivocal, that all these visits shall be for work and not for politics."

In the letter of October 22nd, Keren Hayesod, "a long letter on this matter is being sent you by Mr. Simon. It seems that an agreement has been reached that the Keren Hayesod shall be a grand collection agency, that the Executive shall control the expenditure of funds collected, and that the form of collection activities in each country shall be adapted to the special requirements of the countries involved. Mr. Ben Cohen is writing you separately concerning the form of activity proposed for the Keren Hayesod in America."

This is a letter from Mr. Robert Szold. It further states "Weizmann, Naiditch and Slotopolsky will wait till after our Convention. Weizmann said he would tell whomever he sent to the United States to work absolutely in harmony with L. D. B. I think, however, he now appreciates the possibility of being drawn, against his will, into American internal affairs, or at least being made the occasion for disturbance of effective work, at a time when a strong unified Z. O. A. is essential.

"He wants to make an overwhelming appeal for funds, in co-ordination with, and following the course of Z. O. A. plans."

Letter to London Secretary October 26th, Palestine Budget. First a copy of a cable which was sent by Mr. Ussishkin, Dr. Ruppin and the Secretary of the Zionist Commission, Van Vriesland. Sent October 1st, 1920: "Present position September expenditures covered including 4,500 spend for continuous growing immigration September 1,500 arrived new shipments announced. No balance your remittance left no bank debt all Trust funds paid off. October budget agriculture maintenance Kevutsoth former rate impossible owing to increase from 360 beginning of last year to 920 at present inclusive of 250 Chaluzim budget agriculture 11,400 including Kevutsoth 7,700 afforestation nurses 2,400 agricultural training and experiments in cooperation with Government 1,100 education 12,475 as per budget accepted in London including 2,800 additional salaries. Technical balance to finish works and huts 7,200 immigration 4,500 administration 2,500 total 38,075 send immediately half the amount other half in fortnight

arrival of member executive here to regulate financial situation urgently required."

This cable shows in what critical financial circumstances the Zionist Commission was at that time, October 1st, 1920. The London Secretary in sending a copy of this cable says in his letter of October 26th: "Enclosed herewith are copies of cables with reference to the fixing of the Palestine Budget for the month of October, which I inadvertently neglected to send you sooner. I think myself that despite the urgent needs, it is a mistake to send so much to Palestine now as we cannot do so without, in a sense, encroaching upon the future because it is certain that there is no prospect of our having funds that will enable us to send anything like an appropriation of 24,000 monthly to Palestine in the future. Indeed, it is difficult to foresee how we can continue at all beyond the first of the year. We have been helped through the last few months by fairly large remittances from South America which represent contributions given after San Remo and which we cannot expect every month or quarter."

Now what did our Administration do at the time that the Chaluzim were coming in at the rate of 1,500 a month? Before the London Conference, we were remitting regularly about \$75,000 monthly. After the London Conference, however, for some reason or other, our delegation, or rather, the remaining members of our delegation, stated that there was a resolution to the effect that there are no further obligations on the part of the Zionist Organization of America to provide for the budget of the World Zionist Organization, but that in view of the critical situation, the Zionist Organization of America magnanimously consented to give \$80,000 for the months of August and September, out of the future collections and no more.

Not a word about the Budget or about helping to provide for the budget, from October 1st, 1920. Why did this change come about? Why did we or the leaders with the few remaining members of our delegation in London decide upon such a radical change, decide to refuse to provide for the budget for the World Zionist Organization? We know that the old minority, which is the present majority, is blamed for the disruption of the Organization. Who is actually responsible for it, and when did this disruption begin? Did it begin at the London Conference in July, 1920, when we criticized but refused to participate in the work? The logical consequence of this refusal to participate in the work was the refusal to participate in the budget. After the delegation came back from London, we had to raise the question again of providing monthly contributions to the budget and under great pressure we at last obtained consent from the Administration as well as from Washington to give unconditionally, besides the \$35,000 monthly for the Medical Unit, \$25,000 for other Palestinian purposes. How long did we do that? We did it for the months of October, November and December. We renewed it again for January and February, and in the month of March we sent the last \$10,000 and since then not a cent more.

I have heard here today eulogies of our Chaluzim. I have heard here how the Chaluzim are doing the work themselves. But it is ridiculous, it is profane to talk that way. The Chaluzim are dear to us, but as for seeking to provide funds to settle them on the land, to move their houses, this we did not do, and we are still talking about our participation in the work.

I will not take up any more of your time with the correspondence of the London Secretary and I will come to the memorandum which was adopted by our Executive on March 9th and 10th, 1921.

I was present at the Buffalo Convention, but I could not stay until the end of it. I felt so much disgust at our inactivity since the London Conference that I left the Convention in the middle. I asked that my name be withheld from any nominations, but in my absence I was again elected Treasurer, and only the pressure of my friends induced me to accept. Since then the question that has been taken up at every meeting of the Executive Committee was the Keren Hayesod.

I left America on February 28th. A day or so before my departure, seeing what our administration had in mind, I asked our President not to raise any questions on the philosophy of Zionism or of Nationalism, but to wait until the arrival of our distinguished guests and then begin work on the Keren Hayesod. I said, "Don't bind Dr. Weizmann and his colleagues with any resolutions. Let them have an open mind. Let them give their viewpoint, and you, as a fair judge, listen first to the other side and then pass judgment." The reply was, "Mr. Schweitzer, I will do so." And then, when I saw the memorandum, which was brought to Jerusalem by a member of our Executive Committee I could have wept. I will not pass judgment at once on this memorandum. I will analyze it carefully.

I will not touch the question of *Gegenwartsarbeit*, there has been so much said about it. I will not touch the second paragraph, which deals with the Zionist Organization as the Jewish Agency versus a Coalition composed of representatives of Zionists and non-Zionist organizations or those elected by a general Jewish Congress.

The question about Commonwealth versus Cultural Center is a question for the Congress to decide.

The question of separation of funds for economic development in Palestine from those destined for communal purposes, as far as the Keren Hayesod is concerned, is provided for in the Keren Hayesod by the Keren Hayesod itself. While the collection is made in one fund, this separation is made afterwards by putting aside so much for the national fund and so much for other items and about twenty per cent for economic enterprises, for public utilities, banks, and so forth.

The summary says that the Zionist Organization of America stands for a budgetary system and efficiency in operations in Palestine as opposed to the present financial policies of the Zionist Commission.

The Reorganization Convention, consisting of Simon, de Lieme, and Szold, have criticized the Zionist Commission for not having any budget. How could one expect to have a budget, not having money for the budget? Furthermore, I would say that the budget that has been established or fixed by the Reorganization Committee of £14,500 monthly has been strictly adhered to by the Zionist Commission with the exception of one item, that of immigration, which could not be fixed by the Reorganization Committee, and which is outside of the amount of £14,500.

The sixth point: "A policy of federalism promoting strong responsible federations, as opposed, to a centralization imposing rigid uniformity in methods and means as well as end." This is all very vague and simply words and nothing but words.

Now, reorganization, the Zionist Organization shall become the Jewish Agency in Palestine, displacing the Zionist Commission. Now, gentlemen, what is the Zionist Commission? Is it not after all a part of the World Executive? What is the fight about?

Point "e" on page 2:

"It shall foster the University and Technicum, but entrust the general school system in Palestine to Palestinian Jewry, gradually reducing its subventions, and assisting in the formation of a body, under Palestinian Jewry, to secure general Jewish participation in the maintenance of the school work."

Now, the Reorganization Commission was continually criticizing the Zionist Commission for creating a new *Chaluka* in Palestine. Is not the institution or the formation of a body to secure general Jewish participation throughout the world for school work another kind of *Chaluka*? Page 3, paragraph C:

"The rights and duties of the Federations and the Fractions must be equitably determined and readjusted. At present, the Fractions are practically independent of the authority of the World Organization and assume no financial obligations towards it, yet in combination exercise at times a controlling voice. This is representation without taxation. Such an intolerable situation must be changed."

Surely that was not a matter to be taken up by the Executive Committee of our Organization, but at the Congress.

Paragraph d:

"On the one hand, the World Organization shall apply to *Gegenwartsarbeit* only the funds specifically given for that purpose, and on the other hand, each Federation shall have the right to refrain from participation in *Gegenwartsarbeit*."

Was there ever raised a question of appliance for *Gegenwartsarbeit* only for that purpose? We know very well that since the Annual Convention of July, 1920, our Organization here as well as the World Organization is supported only by *Chaluka* and membership dues, so where does the *Gegenwartsarbeit* come in?

The report of the Reorganization Commission talks continually about unproductive work and productive work. It considered education and immigration as an unproductive item. Naturally the definition of what is productive and unproductive lies entirely with the men who are treating those terms. If education and immigration are unproductive items, the best thing for that Reorganization Committee would be to say simply, "We do not believe in this work, it is unproductive, and let us give it up." As regards Keren Hayesod the memorandum says on page 4:

"The Maaser appeal should be confined to the donation fund; the Maaser principle is inapplicable to investments."

I would like to know whether the gentleman who has prepared this summary had a real conception of the Maaser idea. Here it says the Maaser principle is inapplicable to investments. It is applicable to donations. What was actually the Maaser? In all the history of the Jews, it had to provide for all that the community needed at the time, nor was it at that time a question of whether it referred to donations or investments. This is their conception in the matter. A further statement reads: "This plan for fund-raising in America is an adaptation of the Keren Hayesod to American conditions. Adaptation was inevitable because of

the shifting structure of the Keren Hayesod, the final plan and character of which has not yet been determined."

On the strength of this, no funds were raised since the Buffalo Convention.

Could no funds have been raised, leaving the Keren Hayesod Charter and Keren Hayesod structure to be determined afterwards? Was it right, because of the shifting structure of the Keren Hayesod to do nothing for the last nine or ten months, to raise not a cent more than the Palestine Reparation Fund called for?

For 1920 we raised for the Palestine Reparation Fund \$1,873,000. For so-called Palestinian activities in the year 1920, \$1,277,000 was spent. For the five months of 1921, we have raised the pledges given in 1920, \$206,000.

Of these sums which I mention, the \$1,873,000 and \$206,000, in all \$2,080,000, were actually money that has been pledged in the first eight or nine months of 1920. Since then the Administration did not try to raise a cent more, although they knew very well what were the needs in Palestine. We were talking here all the time about the increase in the number of Chalusim coming to Palestine, about their settlement, but we did not lift a finger to raise a cent.

On page 6 of the memorandum, our president, or the Executive Committee, has adopted the summary, paragraph 3:

"They have since forced the resignation, as members of the executive of Messrs. Simon and de Lieme, whose efforts to reorganize and strengthen the organization for concrete achievement on a sound economic program made them the object of a triple attack. The campaign waged against them and the American leaders has been under the slogan of opposition to *Amerikanisch-Holländisch Geschaefts Zionismus*—a slogan similar to that used in the attack against the policies of Herzl."

It is all very well to refer to the name of Herzl, but it was not proper in this case. Who were Simon and De Lieme in reality? Were they elected as members of the World Executive at the London Conference? No, they were not; they were forced on Dr. Weizmann and Sokolow by our leaders. Our leaders refused to take their share of the work and responsibility in the Executive and they forced these two men on the Executive. Simon and De Lieme were not elected, and naturally as men appointed against the wishes of the Committee and acting on orders from the administration here, they had their own policies which did not agree with the policies of the members of the Executive; and that is the reason why they had to resign. Now the stories about the Keren Hayesod undermining the authority of the World Executive, disrupting the Organization are fables. The real reason for the attack is that Simon and De Lieme were men who were forced by the American leader upon the Executive, and not being the proper men for the Executive, they had to resign ultimately. When both these gentlemen, together with Szold, went to Palestine, they claimed they had plenary power, but plenary power to do what? Not plenary power to close the schools in Palestine, not plenary power to stop immigration into Palestine,—they had plenary power to reform the officers of the Zionist Commission, to bring economy into the various departments of the Zionist Commission, but nothing else. They imagined that they were given plenary power to do almost anything. Why were they astounded then when, on returning from Palestine, they were met with repudiation of all their reports?

I want to point out that in the summary which I have just read the Jewish Colonial Trust and the Anglo-Palestine Company were not mentioned at all. It seems that they are out of the sphere of our activity, as this was understood at that time by our President. Now we come to the historical background and to the actual memorandum of our President. On page 8 he says:

"While the burden of financing the Zionist work in Europe and Palestine was cast upon America and the Western Lands, some of the European leaders organized private enterprises for Palestine development, which through an interlocking of directors with Zionist officials assumed a quasi-official character."

What can you call this? I find no name for it. Where are the facts for this? How could one present a statement without facts? To me it looks like nothing less than insinuations against certain men in Palestine without mentioning the names and without giving the facts:

On page 9:

"The equal participation of the Joint Distribution Committee in the maintenance of the Unit, and American concern in anti-malarial and sanitation work made it essential to continue the Unit under the direction of the American Organization."

Yesterday one of the members of our Executive pointed out that the Joint Distribution Committee had never even considered the question of the American Zionist Organization in relation to the World Zionist Organization and its contribution. The reason for having it named American Medical Unit has absolutely nothing to do with the Joint Distribution Committee and as Mr. Goldberg said today so much has been written and so much has been taken out that the word American could very well have been eliminated in this case as well. Why should it be a specific American contribution? Does the President want to say that he only could trust in it Americans; does the President want to say that the only good doctors are in America, that there are no doctors in Germany or in France or in England or anywhere else or have we special predisposition to do medical work in preference to others?

And further:

"The American leaders, conscious of their public trust towards Palestinian and American Jewry, were convinced that the existing system, or rather absence of system, if allowed to continue, would bring discredit upon our work and lead to disaster. But they felt that with the political question still awaiting final settlement, it was not in the Jewish public interest to raise the question of reorganizing the Organization in London and Palestine."

Here, a reason given for not raising the question of reorganization is that the political question was still unsettled. Is that the real reason? No. The real reason was absence of any intention of participation in the work as I have outlined to you before, since July, 1920, and nothing else. (Applause.)

My friends, this memorandum as it is, is nothing more than either an enumeration of questions not within the sphere of the American Organization, or a slander, an insinuation against our leaders of the World Zionist Organization, and I for one would never agree to approve it. It has been questioned whether the right of leadership rests with personalities, whether men who have been leading the Organization in the

past have the automatic right to be the leaders in the future. But I ask whether the fact that in the last nine months nothing has been done here for Palestine is a claim to leadership. Mere talk about our obligations to Palestine is not sufficient proof of the intentions of the Organization to do anything. Nothing has been done by this organization, and there is nothing to justify the continuation of this leadership. I am for the rejection, for the repudiation of the memorandum. (Applause.)

After announcing that a meeting for Hebraists and those interested in Jewish education was to be held the next day at the Hotel Cleveland, at 10 a. m., the Chairman called upon Rabbi Silver.

RABBI SILVER: My friends, I am not here this evening to attack or defend anyone. The men whom one would wish to attack would not be aided or weakened by the attack. The men whom one would like to defend, need not my defence.

It seems to me we are concerned here primarily with fighting our way through the fogs and the clouds to the pure air and brighter light. I believe, and I am sorry to say it, that whoever wins this fight—to use that naive word—Zionism has already suffered,—not irreparably, because a movement so sacred cannot be permanently hurt.

But I do believe that we have lost much—and I do not speak here in terms of dollars and cents. I assume it would be a platitude for me to say now that our first concern, the concern of all of us, is Palestine. But in the heat of the controversy some of us may have forgotten this. And I would to God that our people and our public speakers and the gentlemen who represent our newspapers had kept this clearly before the eyes and minds of the Jews of America. (Applause.)

You have accused, some of you, unwittingly, unwisely, the leaders whom you have chosen for year after year. You accused them of things which I believe you are beginning to regret. Is anything being said about assimilation by the men whom six months ago you cheered to the echo?

I for one have never questioned the sincerity either of the men who represented the World Zionist Organization or of the men you have selected to represent you. I believe in the sincerity and devotion of the World Leaders, but I believe equally in the sincerity and devotion of the American Leaders. (Applause.) When you shouted and cheered for Brandeis and Mack I, who knew them not at the time, remained silent. Now that you are silent, or speak derogatorily of them, I want to say a word not in appeal to your passions, but because of the cruel things that have been said, and because those who honor and respect integrity should lay a wreath of tribute at the shrine of their names.

You may repudiate Brandeis and Mack. You cannot replace them. (Applause.) I have heard something said concerning the newness of these men in the movement, as though the work should be measured in terms of duration and not in terms of quality and utility. Brandeis may have come to our movement later, and so may Mack—but so did Dr. Herzl come to the movement late. (Applause.)

Our leaders have been accused of being only economic Zionists, not pure-blooded Zionists. Let me say that if Mack and Brandeis were interested only in economics, they could find a wonderful field for their gifts in this country. (Applause.) I am of the humblest in the service, but I attended my first Zionist convention seventeen years ago. I know something concerning the movement in this country, and I say categorically

that anyone who thinks that our leaders have a narrow, circumscribed conception of the movement, is completely and hopelessly in the wrong. (Applause.)

Interruption: FISHMAN: What did you say at London?

RABBI SILVER: I shall come to London in a moment. We do not conceive of Palestine as a place of refuge for our people. Jaffa is not a place of refuge—it is an outpost of civilization. The men who go there do not go there for security and comfort, but for glory. They go there to rebuild on the ancient soil of our people a new Commonwealth and a new civilization, to unify the scattered remnants of our people with a common hope and a common purpose. That is my Zionism, that is Mack's Zionism, that is Wise's Zionism, and that is Brandeis's Zionism. (Applause and cheers.)

Last night some one said that peace is still possible on the basis of the integrity of the World Organization and on the basis of the acceptance of the Keren Hayesod. I say unto you, my friends, and I speak in my own capacity only, that peace is still possible on the basis of the approval of the acts of an administration that acted solely and exclusively on the basis of a mandate given to it by a regularly constituted convention of the American Zionist Organization by an almost unanimous vote. I say that peace is possible on the basis of such an approval, with the understanding that all the difficulties that have arisen incidental to the construction of the subject of the Keren Hayesod be left to the Carlsbad Congress, finally to adjudicate them, and we are ready to abide by those resolutions.

I was ready to abide by the decision of this Convention until I heard Judge Rosenblatt last night say that even if this Convention were to vote down the Keren Hayesod as presented, he would feel not bound by the decision of this body, but by the superior authority of the World Organization. (Applause.)

Interruption: DELEGATE: Right.

RABBI SILVER: There are just two questions that this position of Judge Rosenblatt brings to my mind. The first question is what was the purpose of summoning this Convention, and the second question and a more fundamental question is this: Why were these gentlemen who now speak with such mock piety of the sanctity of the London Conference, why were they all, all unanimously ready to bolt and did bolt from a session of the Conference after a decision had been fully arrived at—

Interruption: MR. LIPSKY: On a point of correction.

RABBI SILVER: You will speak after me.

MR. LIPSKY: I want to make a point of order.

THE CHAIRMAN: I overrule it.

MR. LIPSKY: All right.

RABBI SILVER: I repeat my question again, which I hope Mr. Lipsky will answer when his opportunity comes. Why did all of them retire from the London Conference and sign a manifesto saying that under no circumstances would the American delegation submit to a decision of the London Conference which favors *Gegenwartsarbeit*? The decision was drafted at the request of the entire delegation by myself. The draft was translated by Mr. Emanuel Neumann. The decision was read by Rabbi Silver and Mr. Emanuel Neumann before the Conference, and never

until a few days ago did I hear that this fact was challenged. Opinion, gentlemen, may be facile, may change, but the records have the quality of stability. Those who remember the agitated days in London will recall how much I and many others insisted upon proper representation of America on the Smaller Actions Committee and the World Zionist Organization. We were loyal to it then. We are loyal to it now and the leaders of American Zionism are loyal to the World Organization. So much so, that they insisted upon two fundamental facts. First of all, that the Zionist Organization and not any other body, however constituted, should be the Jewish Agency recognized in the mandate; and secondly, that they are so jealous of the rights and prerogatives of the World Executive that they don't want any of their rights turned over to another constituted or self-constituted body of whatever type or character. We want the World Executive to be the controlling influence in the upbuilding of Palestine. We don't want a World Organization to be starved and stripped of content and to become a propaganda organization solely and exclusively. We want it to be full and rich and powerful and effective in the World and in Palestine, and that is why we ask for the approval of the executive of the World Organization of Palestine. (Applause.)

Rabbi Silver does not step out of the Zionist movement in spite of the fact that you can all stand on your chairs and howl him down. (Applause.) No one, not even duly instructed delegates, can read me out of the movement. (Applause.)

I say that Judge Mack was within the letter and spirit of the Buffalo resolution, as adopted by an almost unanimous convention, and that he has no other mandate and no other authority to go by. Had he acted differently than you instructed in Buffalo, it would have been a usurpation of authority. If your mind has changed for the future, that is your concern, but as for the past, up to this day Judge Mack followed literally, the mandates given to him by your Convention. You have conceded, Dr. Weizmann has conceded, some of his colleagues have conceded that the charter has faults. We have maintained that. At first we were rebuked because we dared to question the Charter, and now it is said universally, leave it to the Congress. Judge Mack said that very same thing weeks and weeks ago. Leave it to the Congress. Let the Congress decide. For the present let us follow the expressed decision of our Convention and build up a Keren Hayesod in consonance with our needs, and then after 60 or 90 days we will come to a congress, the supreme authority in the Zionist World, and its voice will be final. That was not done. Our leaders preferred to force the issue. They preferred to go over the heads of our duly constituted authorities and against their expressed wishes issue a manifesto organizing the Keren Hayesod, creating ill-will and contentions.

I still believe that this contention and this passion and this fury, this turning of brother against brother, was unnecessary. It was a temporary question that could have been, in a true spirit of statesmanship, postponed until the great central body would have spoken. (Applause.)

I am yet to be convinced that our respected visitors from abroad came here with a real, an overpowering desire to establish peace. I do know that seven days before that commission landed on these shores, one of their number who had preceded them, said in this City of Cleveland that there may be a compromise between East and North and West and

South, but between East and West there can be no compromise. That did not appear to me to be the real expression of a soul yearning for peace. I know what transpired before the Commission actually landed on the shore. I know that the invitation to address a reception, which would have been an anti-climax to the official reception of the American Organization was accepted only on the condition that if such an invitation were accepted that the official reception would not be given. Was that invitation rejected? That too did not appear to me at the time as a yearning for peace. I wish I had the time—

DR. WEIZMANN: I will ask Judge Mack to correct the facts.

JUDGE MACK (to Dr. Weizmann): Will you state what the facts are?

DR. WEIZMANN (to Rabbi Silver): You are misinformed.

RABBI SILVER: Will you correct me?

DR. WEIZMANN: No invitation has been accepted and no threat or no pressure has been used on me. I refused to accept any invitation contrary to the wishes of Judge Mack, because I wired, I desired to avoid strife, and therefore I did not accept the invitation. (Applause.)

RABBI SILVER: Dr. Weizmann's word is sufficient for me. I retract what I have said.

MR. WEIZMANN: Thank you. (Applause.)

RABBI SILVER: I do believe, friends, that if our friends were really anxious for peace, some of the things that were said at that meeting, after we had succeeded in getting the two men whom we wanted there, might not have been said.

Friends, my final word. I wish that my action, whatever it be, be not in any way interpreted by anyone as a lack of loyalty to the World Organization. I feel that on this question of confidence, on this question of the Keren Hayesod, I must stand and fall with our administration, and I am ready to abide by the decision of future time. I thank you. (Applause.)

JUDGE MACK: Mr. Chairman, I arise to correct one statement of Rabbi Silver. The at-that-time minority element of the National Executive Committee, knowing of the official reception arranged by the Zionist Organization of America with the co-operation of other Zionists and non-Zionist elements for Sunday, April 10th, persisted in arranging for another reception preceding that date.

I endeavored in every possible way to get them to withdraw the announcement of that meeting and to postpone any other demonstration in honor of the guests at that time until after the official reception of April 10th. They declined so to do, and Mr. Neumann finally insisted that he would be compelled to put the matter up to Dr. Weizmann by Marconi, Dr. Weizmann then being on the ocean. I then sent word to him that if they insisted upon troubling the honored guest himself with these internal differences between majority and minority of the executive committee, I too would be compelled to send a Marconi to Dr. Weizmann advising him that there could not be two such receptions, the unofficial preceding the official, and that if he felt for any reason he would have to accept the unofficial invitation for a meeting preceding the official and not succeeding it, I should feel compelled to absent myself from the reception of April 10th. Dr. S. Levin was advised of this. We both

happened to be in the City of Cleveland a few days before the arrival of the guests, and while they were on the ocean, Dr. Levin advised me that he had sent a telegram to Mr. Neumann.

Interruption: DR. LEVIN: Telephone message.

JUDGE MACK: A telephone and also, from the railroad station at midnight, a telegram, of which Dr. Silver, who accompanied Dr. Levin to the station, and waited for me there till later, informed me of. This was I believe to Mr. Neumann, directing him to postpone the meeting until after the 10th.

When Dr. Weizmann received the first message, that of Mr. Neumann, he sent back a message asking whether we could not in some way unite the two, and when Dr. Weizmann received the second message, that which I had sent to him, he promptly accepted the invitation for the official reception of April 10th, and the unofficial reception that had been arranged without any acceptance by Dr. Weizmann was postponed until April 12th, two days after that of April 10th. Rabbi Silver was in error in stating that Dr. Weizmann accepted the other invitation. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The Convention will come to order. Mr. Lipsky.

MR. LIPSKY: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates: It is a very difficult thing for the ordinary lay mind to keep track successfully of the skein of facts which have been presented at this convention. I had intended to avoid these oft-repeated facts and, instead of bringing before you hearsay evidence and ex parte statements of fact, to discuss with you what we are going to decide tonight. But it seems that as soon as our speakers come to the issue, they are always dragged back into these interminable negotiations.

I want to give you just one instance. Judge Mack has stated certain facts with regard to a reception for Weizmann. I happened to be one of the fourteen individuals who, as Judge Mack knows, were trying to restrain the Committee from holding the reception in advance of the official reception. Yet the impression created by Judge Mack, without any intention on his part, is that we were responsible for the effort to forestall the official reception. There were 800 Jewish Organizations interested in that meeting, and we were trying constantly to persuade them not to hold that meeting in advance. It was a difficult thing, and no one could understand the irrationality of it. We persuaded them to postpone it. I assumed that we had come to a stage where it would not be necessary to advert to these facts, and I did not expect that Rabbi Silver would inject into the proceedings the many things he did.

It was a curious position for Dr. Silver to take up, and shows that in making appeals to sentiment, one need not be logically consistent. Dr. Silver said that he had gone to New York to extend a welcome to Dr. Weizmann. But where was he when Dr. Weizmann was here in Cleveland? (Cheers and applause.)

(Dr. Silver, rising to a point of information, informed Mr. Lipsky and the Convention that he had been appointed Chairman of the Cleveland Reception Committee to Dr. Weizmann, but that in view of the conflict and the impending Convention, the Executive Committee of the Cleveland Zionist Organization wired to Dr. Weizmann to postpone his visit until after the Convention. No answer, said Dr. Silver, was received to that telegram.)

MR. LIPSKY: I am not really interested: I want to point out that there is a great difference between sentiment and logic and that when we are discussing the future of the Zionist movement it is not proper to introduce the element of sentiment and appeal. And a speaker who makes an appeal to sentiment must take the consequences of an appeal to fact. For example, Dr. Silver forgets that in London he was one of the most persistent opponents of the administration, and that when he returned to the United States, then, as a result of what had happened at London, he proposed, not at a Convention, but to individuals, that the leadership should be asked to resign.

Interruption: RABBI SILVER: That statement is absolutely false.

MR. LIPSKY: Before entering into a discussion of what I wanted to say, I come to a point made by Rabbi Silver with regard to his sentiment as to our duty in Palestine. He deplores, as we all deplore, the fact that during the past two months and longer there has existed in Zionism a conflict which has been injurious to the interests of the Zionist movement. But I ask you to judge who has caused this conflict, who has been inflicting the injury, who continued to inflict it till this very day, till this very evening.

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: behind the conflict which is culminating here this evening, there is a history. We are now witnessing the climax of a movement in American Zionism which represents to a large extent a breaking away from the fundamental principles of the Zionist movement. In every movement for an idea it has happened that, when sufficient strength and momentum have gathered, a supreme effort becomes necessary for its success; at that moment there develops in the movement elements that have not the strength to make this supreme effort in the forward direction—and they break away from the movement and the ideal. (Applause.) That is what has happened in the Zionist movement here.

You will remember that when the Sultan gave his people a constitution, there was at that time any number of Zionists who felt that the burden of the movement had come to an end—that no more effort was required. Politics was at an end, and terms must be made with the constitution. All that was left to do was to enter Palestine. And again with Uganda there came a period of doubt. At a moment when all the strength and determination and sacrifice of the Zionist movement expressed itself in a forward motion the same element arose: there grew up the Uganda problem, and there developed some sort of movement away from Zionism and the Zionist ideal. And today we are facing exactly the same situation with San Remo and the Balfour Declaration. Should Zionists, seeing before them the achievement of the Balfour Declaration, feel now a lack of confidence? Yet there are men who, at this moment, unwittingly, and with no desire to leave Zionism, began to develop something which was not Zionism. And this movement has been going on since the Balfour Declaration. It has expressed itself in various ways. It was not conscious of its own progress. Many of us did not know whether it was tending, and probably did not mind as long as the things we cared for were maintained. And now this movement has found expression in the memorandum: but the men that wrote it were not philosophers—they were legalists, and not interested in truth absolute. There are inconsistencies innumerable—but you can see in the

memorandum the inevitable tendency. I do not say that those who framed it were conscious of this, but the memorandum has in it the element of a movement, destructive of all that we have achieved till now. (Applause.)

I will trace it for you so that you can see it for yourselves. The first paragraph deals with *Gegenswartarbeit*. Many of the members of the National Executive Committee thought this was a simple matter. We were against an appropriation for schools in Poland. I voted against that proposition. But I am not against *Gegenswartarbeit*, and I believe that no Zionist can deny the principles contained in it. The thoughts here expressed concerning *Gegenswartarbeit* constitute a denial of the essential unity of the Jewish people, for if we produce in Palestine a living Jewish nationality with a political status, and then deny our relationship to it, we break up unity, and create an American Zionism as distinguished from universal Zionism.

We come to the idea of Federalism as expressed in the memorandum. I know where this idea comes from: it springs from a proposal to have a budget committee which should be made up of the Federations of the World. That is why you find in the addresses of our leaders so many references to American Zionism, to the American contributions to Zionism. Thence comes the idea of the separation of funds, and the idea of the limited responsibilities of the World Zionist Organization. And thus the World Zionist Organization is to become the holder of a small fund, to be used for certain purposes designated with the establishment of the fund. This is the reason that the Reorganization report was endorsed. But this report belongs properly to the Congress, as you know. Those who are affected by that report had a right to be heard in court, but we have taken that report and presented it to the American Zionist Organization as if we were the proper tribunal. We spread that report throughout the United States, knowing at the time that two individuals would be affected by that report: and yet those two individuals were never asked to give testimony with regard to the facts. And the circulation of the *New Palestine* was increased, so that those who were new to the Zionist movement might also learn the good news which the report contained.

There is another item in the report of the Organization Committee, an item which says that the Zionist Organization shall not assume any of the functions proper to the Government of Palestine or any of the functions proper to the Jews of Palestine. When it comes to the building of the Jewish National Home, when it comes to the laying of the foundations of that state, says the report, we must leave these to the Government of Palestine. But according to Dr. Weizmann, and according to any Zionist who knows what is involved, the only right which is given us by the Balfour Declaration, is that very right of proceeding at once with the laying of the foundations of the Jewish State which is subsequently to be confirmed by legal action in other ways. If we are to leave all the functions of government entirely to the Palestine Government, how shall we Jews, without any knowledge in state-building, without experience, develop the qualities needed for building a National Home?

We are told on the other hand that we shall not assume any of the functions proper to the Jews of Palestine, meaning the educational system: this is an assumption that the educational system of Palestine is built up

only for the Jews of Palestine. But this is not the case: the educational system of Palestine is built up for the Jewry of the whole world, as an expression of the Jewish ideal: it is a center from which the Jewish spirit will stream forth. And yet we are told that we must limit that educational system to the bare needs of the Jews of Palestine, that we are through with supporting them—that only for one year and a half must they expect our co-operation in this gigantic task.

You see that the memorandum, poorly as it expresses the real intent of the American administration, reveals itself as a denial of our opportunity, reveals that our American leaders have become skeptical of the powers of the Jewish people. There is one great power that has moved the Jews of the world in the Zionist movement, and that power was the chain which bound all Jews together. If they were weak in Poland, they knew that they were strong here. And because of that there was hope and confidence. But when we break that chain, when we say that we shall control our own work, they lost confidence and strength, and in its place there comes despair. And because of that weakness there arose the desire and longing to liquidate, to place the Zionist Organization in accord with the lowest terms of confidence. Our program is the expression of our faith, and our program goes down as our faith is reduced. In our program for the last year our faith in the Jewish people is expressed in terms of \$60,000 a month. Now, when Dr. Weizmann comes to America, and our faith increases, you see that new faith translated into greater expectation and better results.

Why do you suppose that the Zionist Organization was not able to attract to itself the Jews of this country? It is because in the minds of our administration there was a lack of understanding of their people. I have been in the organization twenty years, and when it was urged upon our administration that they should appeal to the Jewish people, they thought that was a mistaken idea. You have the power of the press. But the papers, they said, do not reflect public opinion. They are made by journalists. And, in saying this, they ignored the Jewish people, and the Jewish people felt it, and our office, which should have been the Mecca of all the Jews of the United States, became instead a branded thing—and that just at the moment when the Balfour Declaration comes, when San Remo comes. (Applause.) That is why there has been spread amongst Zionists the statement of our leaders, the instruction that our allegiance to Zionism is not for the World Organization, but for the American Zionist Organization. Now since the arrival of Dr. Weizmann our administration has had an opportunity of seeing what the Jewish people felt about it, how their authority could not stop them in their enthusiastic support of the things they hold dear. (Applause.)

That separatist tendency has been exerted since the Balfour Declaration, since San Remo, since the London Conference. Though it was known well enough here for what purpose we were going to gather funds, we began by demanding plans, by demanding details first. Resolutions to this effect were voted at Buffalo, but no matter what legal minds may say, every Zionist felt at heart that if the London Executive undertook to differ from the Zionist Organization of America, the wishes of the London Executive should be complied with. (Applause.) And the London Executive did express itself on the Keren Hayesod, expressed itself in terms that were heard throughout the whole world. And Zionists and

non-Zionists the whole world over, heard and were moved. The Keren Hayesod obtained a popularity in New York which a businessman would have paid a million dollars to get for his own enterprise. And, instead of taking advantage of this situation, we devoted ourselves to legal debates, out of which there arose only bitterness of feeling. Every act of the administration with regard to the Keren Hayesod indicated that it did not understand what was before it. "How can you raise money?" was the cry—because they had not been able to raise it in December. Then, when Weizmann came, all the conceptions of the administration were thrown into a controversy with the leaders of the Zionist movement. The guilt for the damage which has been done lies with our administration and with no one else. And now, after infinite debating, after the reading of reams of documents, after the study of interminable reports, it is made clear by this convention that the Zionists are firm in their allegiance to the World Zionist Organization, firm in their belief that through the Keren Hayesod the Jewish Homeland will be established. (Applause.) But, at the last moment, when it is certain that the delegates understand the purport of this memorandum, understand that, in so far as it can be deciphered, it expresses principles and policies with which Zionists have nothing to do, then an appeal is made to the delegates, in the name of peace, that no action should be taken, but the whole matter be left to the Congress. But the Congress cannot decide questions we must decide for ourselves. (Applause.) If our administration has issued this memorandum, and taken a position that is illegal, the Congress is not going to settle that issue for us. We have got to settle it right here. (Applause.)

I want to state clearly now that a vote of confidence is asked for all of these acts of the administration. If we give that vote of confidence, the Keren Hayesod is voted away, the World Zionist Organization is repudiated, the separatist policy as expressed in the memorandum is approved. That is what we are voting on here tonight, and when that question has been settled, we shall know where the Zionist Organization of America stands. I say if we stand for the Keren Hayesod, for the authority of the World Zionist Organization, against the memorandum, then it is our duty not to give the administration a vote of confidence, but to vote for Mr. Neumann's substitute motion. (Great applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Dr. Wise is the maker of the resolution, and has a right to close the discussion. He was called away from the Convention, and has delegated his position to Professor Felix Frankfurter, who will now close the debate.

MR. FRANKFURTER: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Zionists: The issue has been very clearly put by Mr. Lipsky. I am to close, and you are to vote upon one question, namely, the approval or disapproval of the report rendered by Judge Mack as President of your Organization. We have had a slogan for this Convention which Mr. Ussischkin has given us.

Emmes is that slogan: truth; or, as Mr. Lipsky has just put it, and I am grateful to him for it, when we deal with the facts, let us have the facts. I propose, unlike Mr. Lipsky, to go to the documents. He, I can understand it, I can even sympathize with him, he wants to get away from the documents.

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is not a very pleasant task that I will have to perform, but I am just a vehicle. I am merely the organ of facts.

When we deal with the facts, let us have the facts. Mr. Lipsky spoke of absolute truth. I am grateful to him. I shall limit myself to facts, documentary facts, not hearsay, not what somebody said and what somebody else said. Facts! I submit only facts.

And I shall be followed—not at this moment, but sooner or later, when the formality is over—I shall be followed by Dr. Weizmann, and I shall be grateful if he will point out a single deviation from unimpeachable truth in my recital.

I know that so far as numbers go the voting is practically over. But truth is not dependent upon numbers. What I say will be truth, no matter how many of you may vote against the inevitable conclusion that follows from it. (Applause.) What I say will be true when I say it, and after I have said it, and after you vote and after you have rejected Judge Mack for his conduct.

But there may be in this room a few unpledged delegates and in their minds there may be a certain wonder as to how it comes about that Judge Mack and those associated with him should suddenly be worthy of the censure which is about to be meted out to them. Mention has been made on this floor of ill-will. I know of no other reason, and I say it with great sadness of heart.

When I was called upon to state the facts of our controversy before a small body of active and eager Jews in New York, men who were outside the controversy, but who wanted to know the facts so that they might pass judgment, I felt it my duty to lay before them the facts which I shall lay before you. I did it in the presence of Dr. Weizmann. I called upon him then to give reply, and I feel it necessary to call upon him tonight to give reply.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is hardly fair to challenge Dr. Weizmann to speak after the vote is taken. I think that particular statement should be withdrawn or that Dr. Weizmann should be requested to speak before the vote is taken. You have challenged Dr. Weizmann to answer you, and he does not have the opportunity to answer you until after the vote is taken. (Applause.)

At this point Professor Frankfurter had some difficulty in continuing. Dr. Weizmann motioned for silence and took the floor.

DR. WEIZMANN: Mr. Chairman, Fellow Zionists, I beg of you, I implore you to listen to Professor Frankfurter.

PROF. FRANKFURTER: Mr. Chairman, I think you will permit me to say just one word. There has been no suggestion of a challenge. My thought was this. I am dealing with facts. And I merely desire to say to this audience that if any facts that I say are subject to correction or qualification, I shall be grateful, as I said to you, I shall be more than grateful to you or anyone who controverts any of them.

We are here to vote on a report which covers the events in Buffalo, but more particularly the conduct of the administration and of its president in the negotiations with Dr. Weizmann and his colleagues. The question will be asked by some of you at least—"Was it all capriciousness, was it all ignorance that led Judge Mack to insist on what are called safeguards?" Of course, Mr. Lipsky has a different point of view. He knew, since the Balfour Declaration, that Judge Mack does not know Jewish life and does not represent it, that the energy with

which he helped to bring about the Balfour Declaration exhausted itself in that process, and the understanding and effectiveness of Judge Mack as a Zionist leader was gone. I can understand Mr. Lipsky: but I would ask Mr. Lipsky, as one of the trustees of Zionism which every true Zionist must deem himself, why he joined with one Convention after another—with three successive Conventions since the Balfour Declaration, in the unanimous re-election of Judge Mack. (Applause.)

Facts, and not sentiment! An argument in Cleveland in 1921 which Mr. Lipsky knew since 1917—that Judge Mack was not capable of understanding the aspirations of Zionism—that is an explanation after the event. Some of you in this hall genuinely want to know why this present situation has arisen, and it falls to me to tell all the facts, why the American Zionist Organization as represented by the Administration felt it necessary to impose what were called safeguards.

Of course Palestine is not going to be built by bookkeeping. But Palestine is not going to be built by sentiment alone. (Applause.) Roads cannot be built up by sentiment, though the energy which builds them may be provoked by sentiment and only by sentiment.

I have heard a great deal about American history, and I venture to make my own small contribution. We heard Abraham Goldberg, whom we all delight to be amused by (laughter and applause); we heard Goldberg pass all this off as a joke. When it was suggested that two and two makes four the world over, whether in Palestine or in Cleveland, that a deficit is a deficit whether in Palestine or in Cleveland. Goldberg delightfully said he would assume responsibility for the suggestion that finance in Palestine is a different thing from finance elsewhere, because in Palestine we have no finance yet.

MR. GOLDBERG: I will correct it.

(Mr. Goldberg repeated in Yiddish the relevant part of his address.)

MR. FRANKFURTER: I understand. I say that that is a jest, and there is an incident in America that I want to call to your attention. In 1777 to 1778, before the American Revolution was won, when there was no nation, just as there is no Jewish Commonwealth as yet in Palestine, there was a young man, a soldier then of the staff of General Washington, one Alexander Hamilton, who then, in the midst of the war before independence was won, wrote a famous letter in which he laid out the plan for the financial institution of the new republic, if it should ever be born, with safeguards. (Applause.) That famous letter of Alexander Hamilton's, the youth, in 1777, laid the foundation of the National Banking Act of the United States, and was administered some twelve years later by Alexander Hamilton as the First Secretary of the Treasury. During the war he saw the need to project, if ever there should be a nation, financial institutions with safeguards. More than that, sentiment, sentiment alone, was never offered to the Jewish people. Moses did not say, "Be good and you will be happy." "Be good or be Jews." He laid down a very specific code, chapter upon chapter, what to do and how to do it, but I suppose Moses did not understand the Jewish people.

Why was it deemed necessary to ask for safeguards. Not merely because the American organization relied upon general human experience, not merely because it is true, as the great Emerson said, that mankind is as careless and as inaccurate as it cares to be, but, sad as it is to say it, because the American organization has had bitter, persistent, undeniable

experience with the fact that, instead of the lawful authority of the World Executive, there had been a persistent course of conduct indicating disruption, usurpation and denial of the World Executive. (Applause.)

Facts! We ought to go back further, but I go no further back than the Conference of last year. When we deal with the facts, and let us deal with all the facts. The essential question at the Conference last year was the question of the executive. Who should be the new executive? I should not have ventured upon this question. It is to me a most brutal incident, one that I should like to drive out of my memory, but when we deal with the facts let us have all the facts. Mr. Neumann, in a statement called "Causes of the Conflict," a statement widely circulated in the new issue of the *New Maccabean*, and reprinted in a pamphlet, deals with the London Conference and its most important single episode, the so-called plan proposed by Mr. Justice Brandeis for an executive.

Mr. Neumann says: "When Justice Brandeis finally presented the plan to our delegation, it gave rise to protracted discussions, and it soon became evident that the overwhelming majority of the American Delegation was opposed to it. It goes without saying that the delegates from Europe and Palestine were even more strongly opposed to the plan, so that there was no hope of its adoption. From the moment when it became clear that the plan sponsored by Mr. Brandeis was rejected, the tactics of our administration took a new turn."

I put it up to you, ladies and gentlemen, for these are very serious issues, if any of you, knowing no more than what is said in that statement, were to frame judgment upon it, would you not think that you were entitled to have from Mr. Neumann all the facts? Would you not be led to think that there were some other relevant facts in the situation? And when you heard Mr. Rothenberg to-day—and it is my impression that Mr. Rothenberg means to be fair in his statement of facts—didn't you think you were entitled to have all the facts pertaining to that incident? He is a careful lawyer, and when he said the plan was unsatisfactory and was rejected, would you not think, at a convention at which the truth is the slogan, that you were entitled to have no omission of anything relevant to that situation? When you deal with the facts let us have all the facts.

What are the facts? I will say no more than this—that there are among our distinguished visitors those who will best appreciate why I say no more than what I am about to say. I will say no more than this, that Mr. Justice Brandeis plan might have been rejected if it had ever come to a vote. It might have been approved in the course of negotiations and discussion and become a plan. But it never had a chance to be rejected or approved because it was wrecked at the hands of one from whom a different conduct was to be expected. I will leave it thus, and say to you that that conduct involved a number of the executives whose subsequent conduct is very important in the course of this story. I say no more than this, but I am ready to tell the whole story. When this plan became impossible because it was wrecked, a great deal of confidence was gone, and rightly gone. There was then reconstructed this executive, and I am amazed to hear Mr. Schweitzer say Simon and De Lieme were not members of the Executive. I don't believe the President of the World Organization will say any such thing. Dr. Weizmann and Mr. Sokolow were given power to associate with themselves as fellow execu-

tives three other persons. They selected Mr. Simon and Mr. De Lieme, and Mr. Schweitzer says because they were coerced. I do not believe Dr. Weizmann will say that. I believe he will tell you what he told us all, namely, that in Simon we had one of the great men of the Zionist movement, by reason of his devotion, his competence, his executive ability, his capacity for affairs; that is why it was asked that someone of the calibre of Simon and someone of the calibre of de Lieme, with his great experience with the Jewish National Fund, should be united with the other two as members of the Executive. As to Mr. Ussischkin, he and I have very serious differences of opinion on principle. We have had them out for months in Paris in 1919. Mr. Ussischkin is a man of plain truth. He says exactly what he thinks, and he was opposed not because there was not respect always, respect from a man to man, but because he represented views and principles which seemed to us then, and seem now, false and disastrous to the movement. He was picked for political reasons, but there he was. That was the Executive, Weizmann, Sokolow, Simon, De Lieme and Ussischkin, the lawful Executive. There emerged after that Conference adjourned these facts. I shall not recite these because they are much too unpleasant. We are charged with whispering, we are charged with questioning the facts, and we are charged with creating great trouble. What creates troubles? Does trouble create trouble, or exposure?

Interruption—MR. NEUMANN: Please give all the facts.

MR. FRANKFURTER: We have been months, weeks in London, bringing their game to light—the fact that there was used by the Zionist Commission, for Zionist purposes, either thirty-six or thirty-three thousand pounds of funds which did not belong to the Zionist Commission, but to the Joint Distribution Committee. The funds of the Joint Distribution Committee were sent to the Zionist Commission. They were carried by the Zionist Commission, but they were the Joint Distribution Committee's funds sent there for specific Joint Distribution Committee relief purposes. They were used for no Joint Distribution Committee purposes, and the Commission asked them then to use that money for Jewish purposes, but not the purpose for which that money should have been used.

Interruption—DELEGATE: What for?

MR. FRANKFURTER: I don't care what for.

Interruption—DELEGATE: But we want to know what for.

At this point the Chairman called for order again, and stated that the leaders of the majority had begged that no interruptions should be made.

MR. FRANKFURTER: I am trying to be very clear and accurate. I will say ten times if necessary that none of this use of money was for other than Zionist purposes. It is unworthy to make a denial that anyone at that time profited personally.

The Chairman at this point again found it necessary to ask the Convention to maintain order and to permit Professor Frankfurter to proceed.

MR. FRANKFURTER: I will agree with anyone who will suggest that there are occasions when you have to act in this way. There may be emergencies. But I say that you ought to tell a person whose money you use. I say that knowledge should have been conveyed both to those in the Zionist Organization who were responsible in London and to some

American leaders who were working at that end; and the Joint Distribution Committee should also have been advised. They should not have waited till the event came like a thunderclap. I heard the suggestion that it was paid. I do not see the relevancy of that. I say, and here I disagree with Mr. Ussischkin, that it makes a lot of difference whose money it is and for what purpose you use it. I don't care what additions are made, what facts are told, but it was understood that the methods of conducting business in Palestine were loose, inaccurate, undependable, and not a way to obtain the great object on which we were all agreed—how to get the greatest number of Jews into Palestine in the quickest space of time.

We opposed that as a wrong principle, spending money when you have not got it, spending more than you have been promised, or spending money for another purpose than that for which it had been designated. Judge Rosenblatt said that we had these deficiencies in our Government in the United States. The United States can afford that Government. Palestine can not. (Applause.)

We left London practically with the new Executive—I am afraid the phrase will not be liked—on trial. On trial for what? Why, for the mismanagement in Palestine. Do not take my word for it. It was agreed there was going to be a thorough reorganization of affairs in Palestine.

Now just one other fact. When we deal with the facts, let us have all the facts. (Laughter.) Mr. Rothenberg said that we left London suddenly, cutting off the World Zionist Organization of funds and limiting them to definite amounts that we gave. It is a fact, despite what Mr. Lipsky says, that before the war, during the armistice, and after the war, the American organization sent all the money it could collect, without question, without demanding control; it sent all that could be gathered here. When we were through with the London Conference, there was a meeting of our delegation and action was taken; and I think again the impression was left on your mind, whether Mr. Rothenberg intended it or not, that a definite decision was taken in London to cut off the World Executive funds.

After all, when you vote an appropriation, you don't draw on an empty bank. The delegates could not vote funds. The delegates could comprise itself a body until we came back to the National Executive. Mr. Lipsky rightly said the Convention of the American Zionist Organization is the judge of our conduct. The Convention of the American Zionist Organization is the organ of our authority, and pending conventions and meetings, the organ of the authority of the Federation is the National Executive Committee. After a statement of the financial condition, with the terrible difficulties that were experienced in collecting funds in the United States, a statement was made that we should tide over the situation until we got home, report to the National Executive and let the National Executive decide the figures which it would give, \$75,000.00 for such and such purposes, and further payments should be decided by the National Executive Committee in America. All that was done was to tide over affairs until the National Executive Committee met. They were all there. Mr. Lipsky was there. Mr. Rothenberg was there. All they had on this paper were there. Mr. Lipsky voted for this resolution. (Applause.) We came and submitted the situation to the

National Executive, and before long there was a letter from the Executive in London. You think my story of conditions in Palestine are rather emphatic. Listen to this. I am sorry I shall read a document, but I am restricting myself practically to a letter dated London, September 10th. This meeting of the delegates was July 23d. In September the Executive from London wrote a letter to the Zionist Organization, and I read from this letter. The local authority of the World Zionist Organization here speaks:

"In Palestine our administration must not be reformed merely, but rebuilt. With the appointment of so good a friend of our cause as Sir Herbert Samuel as High Commissioner our first efforts must be directed towards establishing a proper system of co-ordination and demarkation of his and our sphere of activity. The work of the future will be radically different from that of the past. New methods as well as new men are required. The intent is to proceed with our work with a view to setting up an efficient and economical machine capable of grappling with the new and difficult tasks. But the building of this new machine cannot be done overnight, nor can it be done by verbal directions from London. The Executive proposes, therefore, to send at once a special commission of reorganization to Palestine, with full and plenary power. Because of the far reaching importance of the work of this commission, it must enjoy the confidence of the whole organization if its work is to be fruitful. We propose to name for it Mr. Julius Simon and Mr. Nehemiah De Lieme. In addition a third member should be named. We are looking (and I hope Mr. Goldberg will carefully listen to this), we are looking for a man capable of shouldering the task, who will at the same time, not only enjoy our confidence but also that of the Zionist Organization of America."

Of course they should have named Mr. Goldberg as such an expert, but Dr. Weizmann thought otherwise. He said, "We believe that Mr. Robert Szold has, by his work in Palestine in the past, proved his eminent qualifications for this peculiarly heavy and responsible task, and we are consequently asking him to become the third member of the Commission of Reorganization. We do not hesitate to say that we regard it as a duty on his part to Zionism to place himself at the disposal of the organization at this critical moment, and we hope that the National Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization of America will urge upon him the acceptance of this responsibility and trust."

I feel particularly justified in dealing with this because a delegate from the floor asked about this so-called Commission of Reorganization, and he was answered that it would be dealt with later by some speaker. I think I am correct in that statement. No speaker on the platform has dealt with this question.

Interruption—MR. NEUMANN: Give us a chance; we will do so.

MR. FRANKFURTER: Give you a chance? Ladies and gentlemen, I want you to consider the meaning of that. Mr. Neumann spoke at great length, and no one will contest his conception of what is relevant to an argument. Mr. Schweitzer spoke and Mr. Rothenberg spoke, and furthermore, Mr. Lipsky spoke. (Applause.) And they did not touch on this, and now they say "Give us a chance and we will talk about it." Now, I am not going to talk about it. (Applause). "We believe that Mr. Robert Szold has by his work in Palestine in the past proved his eminent

qualifications for this peculiarly heavy and responsible task, and we are consequently asking him to become the third member of the Commission of Reorganization. We do not hesitate to say that we regard it as a duty on his part to Zionism to place himself at the disposal of the organization at this critical moment, and we hope that the National Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization of America will urge upon him the acceptance of this responsibility and trust."

This is a letter from the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, and if the fact of it is challenged I know but one man in this room who is entitled to challenge it. This letter came before our National Executive. I have not got it here, though it is part of the minutes of that meeting, and those present that day will remember it; but I wonder if I might not verify that it was a unanimous vote to respond to that invitation insofar as we could urge upon Mr. Szold to accept. And there is a copy of the cable that Judge Mack sent—and I think, ladies and gentlemen, if you will forgive me for saying so, I think these facts are important before in your conscience you decide whether Judge Mack acted with due regard to your mandate given to him at the last convention, or whether he did not do his duty under the circumstances. I beg you to carefully listen to these remarks. I am going to the documents. Judge Mack cabled to London under date of October 7th: "Executive unanimously approved Szold joining Reorganization Committee. Szold is cabling conditions."

What were his conditions; after all, you don't like to be pulled out of your work from New York unless you know for what purpose, and Mr. Szold cabled his conditions, as he had some experience with Zionist Palestinian affairs, and he cabled under date of October 7th: "Second, Reorganization Committee must have plenary power to carry out such changes in Palestine as they in their absolute discretion deem necessary regardless objections or circumstances."

Then in order that they might know his mind, he indicated the trend of his mind on some of the questions. I don't say it was a wise condition. I do not think Goldberg would have imposed conditions if they had worked with him, if they had asked for him. They did not. They asked for Szold, and he had a right to impose all the conditions he wanted on the World Executive, and they had a right to reject all or to accept the proposed modification.

What did they do?

"London, October 9, 1921.

"Zionists, New York.

"For Szold. Grateful for your readiness co-operate. Executive has vested Committee with plenary powers. Expecting you on Aquitania.

"WEIZMANN,
SIMON,
DE LIEME."

Szold went to London, and Szold, Simon and de Lieme started for Palestine. While they were on the water, before they reached Palestine, before there was a report, before they had sharpened their pencils, there was published in the Yiddish press, by the Jewish Correspondence Bureau, under date of October 27th, a statement setting forth an alleged agreement between Jabotinsky and the President of the World Zionist Organization. I shall not say anything in characterization of Jabotinsky or any-

body else. All that I say is that Jabotinsky was one of the men who were sent to be made a member of the Executive in London at the Conference last year, and he was not made an Executive. Just bear in mind that in London, at the Conference, when Dr. Weizmann, Ussischkin, De Lieme and Simon, we finally selected as the Executive, there were a number of gentlemen, leaders in the movement, who were sent to be made executives for whom there was a vigorous movement, and who were not taken on to the Executive. Jabotinsky was one of the most important of these men who wanted to but was not put on the Executive.

While Simon and De Lieme were on the way to Palestine, there was this report of the Jewish Correspondence Bureau:

"Cables published here announce agreement between executives, Jabotinsky authorization of mandate on Palestinian appointment Jewish legion constituent assembly must agree as to commission members Simon, De Lieme to be restricted to inspection and have no authority officials executive to be reconstructed in February, Jabotinsky, Naiditch, Slatopolsky, Directors Yesod. Is it true?—de Haas."

That is, they set forth an agreement between the Executive and Jabotinsky dealing with five matters whereby a mission entrusted to Simon, De Lieme and Szold was to be restricted to a tour of inspection, and an agreement was reached whereby Mr. Jabotinsky was to be put on the Executive upon this reconstruction in February. Keep this fact in mind. They are on the way setting out there to study and report with full and official authority. This cable went to London, and there was a reply back to us by Mr. Cohen, after submitting the cable to the President of the World Zionist Organization and securing his approval:

"Your 114 published cable for most part utterly untrue. Represents not facts but hopes interested parties. It is true Naiditch, Slatopolsky, Feiweil, Jabotinsky appointed directors Yesod but Simon Governor majority control. Jabotinsky has buried difference with Executive but no agreement matters mentioned."

I must ask you to get that. Cables are compact things, expressing conditions, the alleged agreement between the Executive Jabotinsky whereby Jabotinsky was to go in the Executive, whereby Simon and De Lieme and Szold were to make a tour of inspection at Palestine, whereby the control of the Keren Hayesod was to be given to Jabotinsky and Weizmann and Slatopolsky. I am not discussing who had the control or who did not have the control. What I am discussing here is the fact that Mr. Simon and Mr. De Lieme and Szold were on the high seas going to Palestine, that there was a report published while they were on the high seas stating an agreement between the Executive and Jabotinsky whereby their commission with full and plenary power was to be modified into a tour of inspection, and he authorized the sending of a cable saying that that expressly expressed the hope of the party but not the facts. I wish it were otherwise, but I am sorry to say that it is a fact that there was such an agreement between the President of the World Zionist Organization and Mr. Jabotinsky. They were sent. I have heard some talk about the impudence of the American Zionist Organization asking to sit down and making an agreement between the World Executive and itself. The impudence of the Zionist Organization of America in asking to come into an agreement with the World Zionist Organization is apparently wrong; but it is evidently all right for Jabot-

insky to do it. Evidently the officers of the World Organization can make a private agreement while two of the members of the Executive are on the high seas.

I cannot discuss the Reorganization Committee report. I am not competent to discuss it. But you are competent to pass judgment upon the responsibility which rested upon Judge Mack, and you have the obligation to keep in mind that you can judge not the conduct of the World Executive but the usurping conduct of outsiders to obtain the control of the World Executive. We teach obedience. Obedience to whom? To the World Executive. Who is the World Executive? At that time it was Weizmann, Simon and De Lieme, and without the knowledge of Simon and De Lieme an agreement was made by local action, and the American Organization was asked to join in obedience to the request of a single individual who was not a lawfully elected member of the Executive. (Applause.)

That is not all. I shall give you my position in a few words. In all these negotiations on which approval is asked in this report, Judge Mack had in mind the integrity of the World Zionist Organization against the efforts of powerful and vicious and usurping outsiders who wished to get into their hands the power of the World Zionist Organization. Simon and De Lieme were members of the Executive, and this was agreed to, but I think it is the A B C of the movement that every financial instrument of the movement should be controlled, should be subordinate to the Executive of the Organization. Jabotinsky and Slatopolsky were not able to obtain control of the World Executive, but step by step they have obtained control of the Organization, so that now Cowen and Jabotinsky give authority to the President of the World Zionist Organization to make agreements with us. (Applause.)

I don't care whether it was right or wrong that this man should not have been put in control, but an agreement was made on October 26th by which the control of the Keren Hayesod was vested, not in Julius Simon, but in Julius Simon as the agent of the Executive. Why this strange provision that Julius Simon be Governor with 51 per cent in behalf of the Executive? The Executive appoints a Governor and a Board of Directors of the Keren Hayesod, and the Governor, who represents the Executive, has 51 per cent—and Julius Simon was made Governor. October 22d you get this agreement with Jabotinsky by which he was to get into the Executive, and he and Naiditch and Slatopolsky were also to go in the Keren Hayesod. I hope there is no misunderstanding. Naiditch had views and he described them to the other people. He wanted to obtain control. Jabotinsky and Naiditch were both objecting to the provision whereby the authority of the World Executive had 51 per cent control to be exercised in the Jewish National Fund through a single individual. They wanted the change so that the Keren Hayesod group could obtain control and they did it. But did the World Executive say that Jabotinsky should have control? They could not have. That would have been a flagrant misuse of the power of the Executive. This private agreement was invoked, and at their meeting of January 31st, Mr. Jabotinsky appeared at a meeting of the Keren Hayesod. He declared first of all that he had joined the Board on condition that the majority vote of the Governor be abolished and that his entry into the Board on this condition had been expressly approved. I would like to know by

whom. Thereupon, Mr. Simon stated, a resolution was moved to appoint Mr. Joseph Cowen as director to which Mr. Simon replied that such appointment is subject to the approval of the Executive and that he was not prepared to lay it before the Executive before Dr. Weizmann returned from Palestine the following week. Thereupon a motion was put before the meeting that no meeting should be held before the return of the other members of the Executive to London. Mr. Simon had voted against this proposal in his capacity as Governor, but the Directors present left the meeting and the Chairman declared the resolution passed and the meeting at an end. Mr. Simon declared that in the circumstances he was not in a position to exercise the control entrusted to him and to bear the responsibility for the current business of the Keren Hayesod in the manner that the Executive should exercise the necessary steps to safeguard its right of control."

Interruption—DELEGATE: Who was the Chairman?

MR. FRANKFURTER: Dr. Feiwel. The next step is the obtaining of control by those whom the Conference had thought it wise not to entrust the control to. They went on to Palestine, and made their report. I am not going to discuss it, and I say that any discussion of the merit or demerit of the report is unimportant. What is important is whether or not Mr. Simon, Mr. De Lieme and Szold were asked to go, to do certain things as a Committee of three, whether a proper agreement was made between the parties. These are the relevant facts that you have to consider. Mr. Simon and De Lieme were forced out. They resigned. Why did they resign?

Mr. Lipsky here rose to a point of order.

MR. LIPSKY: I feel compelled to state that according to rules of discussion new matter introduced in the summing up speech—matter that has not been referred to in the course of discussion—leaves the speaker open to reply.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will decide the question when it arises.

MR. FRANKFURTER: We have heard a good deal of *Gegenswartarbeit*, but I don't believe that those who know Mr. Simon or the President of the World Zionist Organization would dispose of them otherwise than with the greatest respect and affection. Mr. Simon and Mr. De Lieme, in a letter dated the 20th of January, made the following communication to the Zionist Organization. The letter was addressed to the president of the Zionist Organization and the Chairman of the Executive, Zionist Organization, London.

"LONDON, W. C. I.,
20th January, 1921.

To the President of the Zionist Organization, and the Chairman of the Executive of the Zionist Organisation, London:

GENTLEMEN:

"We beg to confirm herewith our resignations as members of the Executive of the Zionist Organization. Further reflection has only strengthened our conviction that in the existing circumstances the possibility of productive work does not exist for us, and that it would be a grave wrong to the movement to continue to bear the responsibility for the policies of the Executive as it is at present motivated.

"We did not seek membership in the Executive, we entered it only at your request and in the belief that it was your intention to repose in us your full confidence and to give us your whole-hearted support. You were aware at the time of our expectations as well as of our misgivings, and it was only on account of your assurances, then and subsequently given, that it was your sincere desire to have us as your colleagues in an Executive which should be capable of a clear policy and of constructive action that we consented to serve.

"We knew the great difficulties we faced. We were conscious not only of the intrinsic difficulty of the tasks of the Zionist Organization in Palestine, but of the necessity of strengthening the movement both morally and materially and of reshaping and remoulding it in order to make it the better adapted to its new economic work. We were not unmindful of our own shortcomings. We ourselves desired that the Executive should be strengthened not only so that its capacity for concrete achievement would be much more commensurate with the requirements of the movement, but so that its moral authority and influence throughout the Jewish world would be increasingly recognized. But we could not see how the Executive would be strengthened by the accession, for political reasons, of men of the most divergent viewpoints collectively incapable of following out a unified and clearly defined policy. We had, and have, no reason to doubt that European Jewry has full confidence in you, its chosen leaders, and we thought that if in the reorganization of the Executive its power and prestige were to be increased, the new members should, other things being equal, be drawn from the Jewish communities of England and America, upon which must rest a very large part of the financial burden of Zionist work.

"But it has become increasingly evident that you did not bring to the Executive, upon which you asked us to serve, the help and support of your friends and followers. There has been no time since we entered upon our office that their ungrudging co-operation has been given. From the very first, demands and ultimatums were made upon us. These occurrences might have caused little difficulty—perhaps they would never even have arisen—were it not for the fact that those responsible for them were known to have your sympathy and passive if not active support. It would be unfitting for us to dwell upon the widespread agitation carried on against us by these self-same people. While we may be inclined to dissociate you from a great deal of their works, the organization as a whole cannot understand that their actions were not known and approved by you.

"Moreover, it was at your persuasion and against your own better judgment that we entered into an agreement regarding the Keren Hayesod, which, if it did not bind the hands of the Executive, did tend to call into question its authority and moral position. The agreement gave official recognition to a group which considered itself co-ordinate with the Executive, whose authority it continued to flout and condemn. This group never evinced the slightest sympathy with our efforts to reform, reorganize and strengthen the movement and its work in Palestine. They opposed us at every turn. They perpetuated the old and discredited method which combined and confused propaganda and practical work, to the degradation of both.

"During our absence in Palestine the situation became aggravated. Upon all fundamental matters you took counsel with the Directors of the Keren Hayesod as if they, and not we, were your colleagues sharing the responsibility devolving upon the Executive.

"As soon as we reached Palestine the press published reports of an agreement by the Executive of the Zionist Organization with Mr. Jabotinsky, of which agreement we had never heard. While the reports published may have been grossly inaccurate, it was true that one or both of you, in our absence, without our consent, and without the slightest ground for expecting our subsequent confirmation of your acts, did come to an agreement with Mr. Jabotinsky concerning the following points:

"a. The powers of the Reorganization Commission would not be unlimited and unqualified. The exact form of this engagement we do not yet know, but it is clear that no representations whatsoever of this character should have been made in view of the express understanding recorded in the minutes of the Executive and confirmed orally and by telegraph to Mr. Szold that the powers of the Reorganization Commission should be plenary.

"b. Mr. Jabotinsky was assured that you would support his nomination as a member of the Executive. We have already stated that we favor a strengthening of the Executive in a way which would render more effective the reorganization of our work. But you bound yourselves privately without consultation with us to an arrangement which destroyed any prospect of a homogeneous Executive with ourselves as members.

"c. The Jewish legion was, according to your agreement, to become an accepted and important part of Zionist policy. The British Government was, we understand, advised that the Zionist Organization was prepared to meet certain commitments in connection with the maintenance of the Jewish legion which might involve an expenditure of £40,000 or more a year. The Zionist Executive did not approve of these commitments, and the Zionist Organization was, consequently, not bound thereby. We could not approve of these arrangements either as a matter of financial or political policy.

"Moreover, in answer to a message from Mr. Yellin and Dr. Lurie protesting against the policy of the Reorganization Commission working towards the relinquishment of the school system in Palestine to the Yishub and the gradual reduction of the Zionist subvention, one of them sent a telegram stating that the Keren Hayesod would do the utmost within its statutes to keep and develop the existing school work. Your associates on the Keren Hayesod also sent telegrams to Mr. Ussischkin and Dr. Ruppin protesting against our immigration policy, not because it was wrong, but because it interfered with their propaganda. It is needless for us to point out that messages of this kind coming from London served to create the impression that there were divided counsels in the Executive, and that we spoke not as your trusted colleagues, but for ourselves alone.

"The few instances cited are only symptomatic of the conditions that exist which render constructive work impossible. The authority of the Executive having been undermined and its influence destroyed, we have no alternative but to resign. If you desire we shall hold office until the next meeting of the Actions Committee on February 13th, but no longer. In the present circumstances it would be a grave disservice to the Zionist

cause for us to continue in the Executive when policies are pursued with which we fundamentally disagree. No worthwhile program has a fair chance of success, unless it has the full-hearted support of a homogeneous Executive. Since our efforts have failed to elicit your support, it would be wrong for us to remain on the Executive, thus allowing the failure of a different policy to be ascribed to our obstruction.

"It is time that the issues should be faced. It would be purposeless now to confuse and avoid them by short-sighted compromises. We believe that the Jewish people are quite capable of appreciating the gravity of our tasks. We believe they should be told the plain truth regarding our immediate possibilities and future prospects. The Jewish people are quite able to consider the facts soberly and thoughtfully. They can understand that immigration can proceed only as funds are placed at our disposal and as preparations are made for the incorporation of the new settlers in the economic life of the country. The Jewish people will realize, moreover, when the facts are explained to them, that even with the greatest response to our appeals for funds, it will not be possible for immigration to take place on a large scale unless we restrict our expenditures rigidly to colonization work.

"The Zionist movement is passing through a difficult and critical stage. The confusion of propaganda and institutional management, while never warranted, was natural and could perhaps be tolerated when the chief task of the movement was the organization of ideas. But that confusion is intolerable, when the primary functions of the movement become the organization of practical work, the economic upbuilding of Palestine. If that confusion is allowed to continue, we fear that it may result in the exclusion of the Zionist Organization from a large part of the economic work. The tendency in that direction is already observable in the negotiations carried on and the agreement arrived at in our absence, with Sir Alfred Mond, the Chairman of the Economic Committee. We view with deep concern this tendency to restrict the Zionist Organization to non-economic activities and to hand over the economic work to a committee whose trust is not clearly defined and on which the responsible representatives of the Zionist Organization are in a small minority. The proposals which were made last summer to the Annual Conference for the participation of non-Zionists in our work, and which were given up supposedly because they went too far, never contemplated such abandonment of the economic functions of the Organization.

"We are not jealous of the Economic Committee and its powers. We are more concerned with the future of the Jewish National Home than the Zionist Organization. But we feel that the vitalizing force of a popular movement is in all circumstances indispensable to the real success of the Economic Committee. It is essential that motive power of the one be linked with the trained intelligence and business sense of the other. If the Zionist Organization is reduced to a mere propaganda and subsidizing agency it will become powerless and ineffective as an instrument for the economic upbuilding of Palestine. If the Economic Committee is not intimately associated with the Zionist Organization, it will be but another I. C. A. Parallelism of action would be as fatal to the one as to the other. The two must be brought together as the responsible agents of the Jewish people in the great task of reconstructing our national homeland in Palestine.

"We wish that we could take a more encouraging view of the immediate future. We hope that our misgivings may prove unfounded. But whether our views be right or wrong, it is clear that the Organization should have a homogeneous Executive, united in policy, even though that policy be wrong, for a house divided against itself cannot stand.

"Yours faithfully,

"(Signed) NEHEMIA DE LIEME,

"JULIUS SIMON."

Ladies and gentlemen, the suggestion comes from Mr. Lipsky that this is new matter. This is not new matter. It is referred to in this report of Judge Mack's specifically as one of the phases of his conduct, and it is this report which you are asked to approve or condemn. Yet it is new matter because they have not dared to discuss it up to now. (Applause.)

There are two sound reasons for dealing with these matters. One that there should be on record, however disagreeable this is, a full and detailed statement of all the facts which we are dealing with. And, secondly, those of you who are open to reason, and I assume there are such, would like to hear these facts. (Applause.)

Who undermined the authority of the World Executive and destroyed its influence? Simon was undermined and destroyed by the illegal and usurping conduct of Jabotinsky and the others, who had no power to assert themselves or dominate the situation. (Applause.)

Since this event it fell to me as the spokesman of the American Organization to come to the European Zionists and say that the American Zionists recognize only one leader, and that is Dr. Weizmann. I could say it, because I spoke for others. I had to say that to some of the leaders in Zion. Dr. Weizmann is the only head of the Organization. Discipline! We ask not only for loyalty, but discipline! Who undermined it, who destroyed it? We?

Interruption by several delegates: Yes.

MR. FRANKFURTER: Goldberg says yes: Simon and De Lieme, of the Executive, which we are bound to respect, say no. (Applause.) Discipline! Where was discipline on the part of the members of the World Zionist Organization?

Discipline! What does discipline mean? Discipline means lawful authority of the World Zionist Organization. It does not mean letting yourself, I care not for what reason, be moved by the pressure of an outside force and doing it in secret. Simon and De Lieme stepped out and who stepped in? Jabotinsky. If you ask me to cheer for the hero Jabotinsky. (Applause and cheers.)

If you ask me to cheer for the hero Jabotinsky—(Applause and cheers.)

If you ask me to cheer for the hero Jabotinsky—(Great applause and cheers. I will stay here all night and cheer with you. (Applause and cheers.)

You can have Jabotinsky if he were properly voted for, but nobody, not even Jabotinsky, can usurp the powers of the Organization. (Applause.) The place to elect Jabotinsky was London, at the Conference. But he was not appointed and approved by the Actions Committee. He was appointed and approved by Dr. Weizmann and Sokolow.

Interruption: DR. LEVIN: Be fair; you are telling only fifty per cent of the truths. Tell all the facts.

MR. FRANKFURTER: I don't suppose it is right for me to say that a guest on this floor is using German in a slipshod way which his age should have prevented him from using.

At this point the Convention refused to permit Prof. Frankfurter to continue. The delegates hissed the speaker until the Chairman restored order.

On the restoration of order Dr. Levin informed Professor Frankfurter that the latter had misunderstood a remark of his.

PROFESSOR FRANKFURTER: Then I beg your pardon. I have to make another remark. Dr. Levin said that Simon and De Lieme were put there by force.

It will be sufficient to read a statement of Simon and De Lieme to Dr. Weizmann and Sokolow: "We did not seek membership in the Executive. We entered it at your request." I have a different answer to make to Dr. Levin, one that goes to the very heart of this controversy. If Dr. Levin is to sit in judgment upon the Executive, and if he decides Simon and De Lieme were on there by force, are they therefore to get off? Is he the repudiator of the Executive? Is every man to sit in judgment? Has any man the right to sit in judgment as Dr. Levin is sitting in judgment and saying, "Simon and De Lieme were put on there by force." Is that respect for the World Executive? Is that respect for law? Is there any respect left in some of our leaders for law? Find an agreement that has some element of understanding about it. The very fact that it was private showed that there were reasons why it should not be published.

Interruption, DELEGATES: We want to vote.

MR. FRANKFURTER: Votes do not decide the truth of an issue. You will have your vote and we will go out from office, neither your talk nor your impatience can drive any of us out of our deep and obedient desire to work and work and work for Palestine in the ranks of the American Zionist Organization. (Applause.) You will cast your vote, but it will be done after all the facts as we see them are put with moderation, with aching heart, but with honesty into the permanent record of Zionist history. (Applause.) That is the background. That, ladies and gentlemen, may illuminate some of you and there are some of you here, I know, who want to know the facts. That may explain to some of you why safeguards are important. Do you think Judge Mack is interested in bookkeeping? Yes, he is interested in bookkeeping, but not just for the joy of it. He is not a fanatic on scientific management. He is not a card index man, but he is a Zionist and wants brotherhood in Palestine. (Applause.) All of us at Buffalo unanimously voted for the separation of donations and investments, not because this is a nice word or a nice phrase, but because American experience showed that donations and investments must be separated. All of you voted for that and Mr. Lipsky may talk and talk and talk, he may sneer about legal technicalities with a quality and a talent that most lawyers would envy, but the fact is that the Buffalo Convention adopted that after mature thought with not a dissenting vote and not a dissenting murmur and without a thought—

Interruption—MR. LIPSKY: Subject to the approval—

MR. FRANKFURTER: No, sir, you can say that in eight different languages, and you will not be in accordance with the facts. More than that, afterwards there was correspondence between Dr. Weizmann and Judge Mack and I have the correspondence; there never was a suggestion, never a thought other than that the Federation of this country would have to adopt the mode of raising money. Why should they want it otherwise? What is the motive? Did Judge Mack want to become president of the World Zionist Organization? Did somebody else want to become president of the World Zionist Organization? If he wanted to control, he meant only to have the assurance that money will be raised in an orderly thrifty, ship-shape manner, he meant safeguards to be placed on the expenditure of money in Palestine so as to avoid repetitions. All of us would like to regard that as a closed chapter in Palestine administration, and safeguards should be placed against the lawless, brutal, usurping, illegal conduct of Jabotinsky. That is why Judge Mack wanted to work out in detail with Dr. Weizmann the *modus operandi* for raising the funds in this country. On this report, on page 3, are set forth quotations from letters from the president of the World Zionist Organization to Judge Mack indicating that the methods of raising the monthly amount be fixed uniformly for all countries, that the method for working it out is expected to be done, and Dr. Weizmann will come here to work it out in Convention with you. That is nothing new, all this foolish business. They talk about the World Zionist Organization as though it were the United States, consisting of a compact constitution with a president and vice-president and all the other machinery. What is the Zionist Organization? It is an organization of Federations, and if you talk about statute, about lawful authority, about obedience, I say obedience to what? Obedience to the profound interpretation of Dr. Levin? Obedience to the profound interpretation of Mr. Jabotinsky?

Obedience is obedience to the lawful authority and the underlying lawful statutes which govern an institution. Here is the law of the World Zionist Organization.

"In order to cover any prospective or actual deficit the Congress, as well as the Central Committee, can levy special contributions from the general body of the Federations assessed according to the members belonging to each Federation. These assessments shall be remitted without deduction to the Inner Actions Committee."

Mr. Rosenblatt talks as though the Zionist Organization is like the State Government or Federal Government, where the police are sent out to collect it. The Zionist Organization of the World is a federation, and federate means that each federation acts in conjunction with the World Organization Executive. We were told and we are told that upon America rests the duty of supplying from eighty to ninety per cent of the resources for our needs. If that task and burden rests upon this country, then there must be worked out in detail the way best suited to this country. We don't want control now. We never wanted anything except what we want now: a strong World Executive acting with strict obedience to its own mandate, listening to no force, however urgent, however powerful, however logical, inclining to no authority other than that given by the Congress.

The vote needs only formally to be taken. Ladies and gentlemen, I have summarized necessarily briefly a long series of arguments; the thing

is a matter of long, long months, with many intricate facts. I have summarized the facts to indicate why Judge Mack, whom you have year after year, unanimously elected as your president, thought necessary to do the things which are set forth in his report. Your vote is about to be taken, fellow delegates. That vote will decide what principle shall be enforced in the coming year by this organization, and what men will enforce these principles, and necessarily the power will go with the responsibility and the responsibility must go with power. (Applause.) You have heard the speech of Mr. Lipsky, the summary of the condemnation of inactivity by the administration. The time is coming when Mr. Lipsky and his colleagues will undertake the burden of guiding the destiny of the American Zionist Organization. (Applause.) We all wish them well, for there is here really a conflict of ideas, and not the least idea is, that it does not matter how you keep your books, or how you keep your budget, so long as you have tremendous speeches. It is for you to decide the issue. The responsibility is with you. The duty and privilege of continuing the work for Zion rests with you. (Applause.)

MR. NEUMANN pointed out to the Chairman that in view of the frequent references made by Prof. Frankfurter to himself, and in view of alleged misquotations of himself, he felt himself entitled to a reply to Prof. Frankfurter.

THE CHAIRMAN ruled that in view of the fact that no matter had been introduced by Prof. Frankfurter into his speech other than that contained in the report of the President of the Organization, the debate was closed, and it would therefore be impossible for Mr. Neumann to make any reply.

The Chairman announced that the motion which would be submitted to the Convention would be Mr. Neumann's substitute motion, and that a vote for Mr. Neumann's substitute motion would therefore be a vote against the administration.

The Chairman then directed the Secretary to call the roll of the Delegates, the voting being taken by the roll. At the end of the roll call the Chairman announced that Mr. Neumann's substitute motion was carried by 153 (one hundred and fifty-three) votes to 71 (seventy-one) votes.

JUDGE MACK: Fellow Zionists, I desire to express first my deep appreciation of the manner in which the Chairman from the first moment of his installation to the present moment, and I am certain to the conclusion of this Convention, has conducted and will have conducted the proceedings. You made a wise choice.

Second, I desire to thank the Zionists of America for having given me, three years ago at Pittsburgh, two years ago at Chicago, last year at Buffalo, during the three critical years in the development of the Zionist Organization, both of the World and of America, the opportunity to have some share in the working out of the great problems which have confronted and for years to come will confront Jewry.

Thirdly, I accept, of course, what I foresaw long ago, the conclusions to which you have arrived. Self-respect from one who conceives that he performed the tasks entrusted to him by you and discharged the responsibilities placed upon him by you and your predecessors, as delegates to the past three conventions of the Zionist Organization of America, compels me to retain the office and the duties and the responsibilities

attached thereto for not a single moment after the vote has been cast. I therefore resign. You may consider it but an idle form inasmuch as my office, the term of my office, will expire in any event within a day or two, but for me, I assure you, it is no idle thought. I therefore resign, and place back into your hands the office, with its duties and responsibilities, as President of the Zionist Organization of America, as Member of the National Executive Committee, and as Member of the Greater Actions Committee to which your predecessors elected me. I desire to read a letter addressed to me:

"Stoneleigh Court, Washington, D. C.

"June 3d, 1921.

"MY DEAR JUDGE MACK:

"With the principles and policies adopted by the National Executive Committee under your leadership I am in complete agreement. Strict adherence to those principles is demanded by the high Zionist ideals. Steadfast pursuit of those policies is essential to early and worthy development of Palestine as the Jewish Homeland. We who believe in those principles and policies cannot properly take part in any administration of Zionist affairs which repudiates them.

"Upon the delegates in convention assembled rests the responsibility of deciding whether those principles and policies shall prevail in the immediate future. If their decision is adverse, you will, I assume, resign, and in that event present also my resignation as Honorary President. Our place will then be as humble soldiers in the ranks to hasten by our struggle and policies, which we believe will be recognized as the only ones through which our great ends may be achieved.

"With every good wish,

"(Signed) LOUIS D. BRANDEIS."

Next I tender you by authority and direction the resignation of Stephen S. Wise, Honorary Vice-President and member of the National Executive Committee and member of the Greater Actions Committee. By further direction I send you the resignation of Harry Friedenwald, the Vice-President, and member of the Greater Actions Committee; Nathan Straus, Vice-President, both members also of the National Executive Committee, and Jacob de Haas, Secretary of the Palestine Department, and as such, members of the National Executive Committee. Further, by direction, I send in to you the resignation of Felix Frankfurter as member of the National Executive Committee and as a member of the Greater Actions Committee. Further I send in to you by direction the resignation of the following members of the National Executive Committee:

Maurice L. Avner, Pittsburgh, Pa.	Nathan D. Kaplan, Chicago, Ill.
Israel B. Brodie, Baltimore, Md.	I. Irving Lipsitch, San Francisco, Cal.
Benjamin V. Cohen, New York City.	Emanuel N. Mohl, Jerusalem, Palestine.
Max J. Finkelstine, Scranton, Pa.	
Bernard Flexner, New York City.	Louis S. Posner, New York City.
George Gordon, Minneapolis, Minn.	Samuel Rittenberg, Charleston, S. C.
Max L. Grant, Providence, R. I.	Sol S. Rosenbloom, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Max Heller, New Orleans, La.	Jerome J. Rothschild, Philadelphia
J. D. Jurman, Waterbury, Conn.	I. Rude, Denver, Colo.
Horace M. Kallen, New York City.	William Sauber, Green Bay.

Aboa H. Silver, Cleveland, Ohio.
David W. Simons, Detroit, Mich.
Robert Szold, New York City.
S. J. Waldstein, Boston.
Leo Wolman, New York City.
Irma Lindheim, New York.

Samuel J. Rosensohn, New York City
Harry H. Levenson, Boston.
Jonas Rosenfeld, Dallas.
Rabbi N. H. Ebin, Buffalo, N. Y.
S. Shapinsky, Louisville, Ky.

Further, I desire to state that in view of the vote of lack of confidence involving not only the President, but each of the gentlemen who with the President have now resigned, and who fully and unequivocally believe with the President that the policy and principles acted upon during the past year by them, and reported to you in the President's report to be the only policy and principles upon which early success in our great movement can be obtained; of course, we will be unable to accept any position of responsibility at the hands of this Convention. I further desire to state, not so much to you as to the ordinary Jewry, that no action which you have taken, no action which you will take, no action that you can take will ever drive me or any of the other gentlemen whose names I have mentioned from the ranks of membership in the Zionist Organization of America, and will never lessen by the slightest degree the intensity of their Zionism, their devotion to Palestine and their continuous zealous work for the one single complete platform of the World Zionist Organization; and finally, I desire personally to tender to my successor my deepest and most heartfelt co-operation in the achievement of our end and the offer of any abilities that I may have as a result of the experience which your predecessors as delegates have enabled me to attain by the responsibility that they have placed upon me. (Applause.)

MR. GOLDBERG: I move you to adjourn this meeting to eleven o'clock to-morrow morning.

DELEGATE: Second the motion.

DR. FRIEDENWALD: May I have the permission of the floor? May I be permitted to read a letter from a member, from Mr. Israel B. Brodie, who is a member of the Executive Committee and a delegate unable to attend?

"June 3d, 1921.

"DEAR DR. FRIEDENWALD:

"It grieves me very deeply to be obliged to inform you that the trial of an important case on Monday, June 6th, in the Federal Court, before Judge Rose, will prevent me from attending the sessions of the Zionist Convention as a duly elected delegate. . . .

"You are familiar with my views on the issues involved in the controversy that will be determined at the Convention. I stated them in detail at the last meeting of the Baltimore District Board, and they were known to the Zionists by whose votes I was elected a delegate to the Convention. But I desire to indicate them unequivocally in this letter, so that I may share as fully as my absence allows in the responsibility of determining the questions that will come before the Convention.

"The Keren Hayesod in its present form and under its present auspices is calculated to subvert not only the authority of the Zionist Organization but the cause which the organization serves. At the London Conference it was the understanding that control of the Keren Hayesod would be completely and unequivocally vested in the Zionist Organization. The

manner in which the Organization is deprived of effective authority in the charter of the Keren Hayesod is patent and cynical. The suggestion that the charter can be amended at some time in the future is both irrelevant and disingenuous.

"But I do not merely object to the form of organization of the Keren Hayesod. The approach to our problems in Palestine and the Diaspora, as indicated by the leaders of the American Organization, is, in my judgment, sound. It is of the gravest importance that these views, which I conceive truly to represent the judgment of American Jewry be given due weight in the formulation of the Zionist program. My experience and my contacts in London have taught me that, unless the American Organization is now sustained, it is useless for American Jewry to send any delegation to the forthcoming Congress. Views differing from those held by the present Executive of the International Organization will be accorded short shrift. This would constitute the gravest possible danger to our work and to the unity of Israel.

"This outline of my position indicates how I would vote both on questions relating to the organization of the Convention and on resolutions dealing with substantive problems.

"Will you do me the kindness to present this letter at the Convention in such manner as you may see fit, and to see that it is embodied in the record of the Convention?

"Sincerely yours,

ISRAEL B. BRODIE."

JUDGE MACK: Might I add that I inadvertently omitted to say, that at my earnest request, in order to not in any way embarrass the officers of the Organization, Mr. Reuben Horchow, who authorized me to tender his resignation as Acting Secretary for Organization, and as Assistant Treasurer and Acting Secretary of the Organization, ex-officio member of and the elected Secretary of the National Executive Committee, withholds his resignation, to be accepted at the pleasure of the Chairman of this Convention. Further, that with the Secretary for the Palestine Department, the resignations are offered of the two Assistant Secretaries, Mr. Alexander Sacks and Mr. Hubbard, and the resignation of the Director of Publicity, Mr. Fromenson.

Thereupon the session adjourned at 2:00 o'clock A. M., to reconvene at 11:00 o'clock A. M.

FIFTH SESSION

HELD AT THE HOTEL CLEVELAND, CLEVELAND, ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7TH

The Convention was called to order at 11:45 A. M. by the Chairman, Judge Henry J. Dannenbaum.

The Chairman announced that several of the Committees were still in session, and that it seemed advisable that the Convention should adjourn until one o'clock, when the reports of the Committees would be presented.

MR. BARONDESS raised an objection to this procedure, inasmuch as the majority of the delegates would have to leave Cleveland the same day, which would make it impossible for them to attend the Convention till later than 5 P. M. Mr. Barondess suggested that such of the Committees as had their reports ready should be dealt with at once, the others to follow as they completed their reports.

MR. MORRIS SENN, of Philadelphia, stated that there were one hundred and twenty delegates serving on the eight Committees, and that it would be impossible to discuss reports in the absence of so large a number.

After discussion it was decided that the session be adjourned until 1 P. M.

Whereupon the session adjourned at 12 noon, to reconvene at 1 o'clock.

SIXTH SESSION

HELD AT THE HOTEL CLEVELAND, CLEVELAND, ON TUESDAY, JUNE 7TH.

The Convention was called to order at 1 P. M. by the Chairman, Judge Henry J. Dannenbaum.

After making various announcements relating to accommodation of delegates, the Chairman stated that the first business before the Convention was the election of two Vice-Presidents of the Convention.

. MR. BARONDESS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that in order to be genuinely democratic, and in order that all the important centers of Jewry should be represented in the Præsidium of the American Zionist Organization, it would be appropriate to amend the proposition of the Committee and elect five Vice-Presidents instead of two. With that object in view, and believing that what I have said should be taken as a motion, I wish to make one nomination. I take great pleasure in nominating as one of the Vice-Presidents one of our brothers, with whom it has been a privilege to work in a spirit of love and true comradeship, a man that has given many years of loyal and devoted service to the Zionist cause, a man who is a Jew not by accident merely, but a Jew by choice, with whom Zionism is a second nature, not a theory, a good Zionist and a fine type of American citizen. It affords me great pleasure to place in nomination Mr. Max Shulman of Chicago.

The nomination was seconded from the floor.

MR. AB. GOLDBERG: I wish to nominate a man who needs no recommendation to the delegates of this Convention—Mr. Morris Rothenberg, of New York. (Applause.)

The nomination was seconded from the floor.

REV. SWIRE, of Albany: I want to nominate a man about whom words would be superfluous. He is well known to the body. He deserves the support of every person present. Unfortunately he was compelled to resign from the former administration, and we must show him to-day by a unanimous vote in his favor that we stand behind him in everything he has done. I take pleasure in nominating Mr. Louis Lipsky.

THE CHAIRMAN informed the Convention that Mr. Lipsky had stated his desire that the two nominees already before the Convention should be elected Vice-Presidents.

The closing of nomination of Vice-Presidents having been moved, seconded and carried, the President submitted to the vote the nomination of Mr. Max Shulman of Chicago and Mr. Morris Rothenberg of New York as Vice-Presidents of the Convention. The nominations were carried.

THE CHAIRMAN then called on Dr. Hilkowich to address the Convention on the Palestinian situation with special regard to the Medical Unit.

DR. A. M. HILKOWICH: Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, ladies and gentlemen, the subject that I wish to speak to you about ought, I believe, to be very dear to you. I intend to say a few words about the American Zionist Medical Unit. As you all know, the American Zionist Medical Unit's activities in Palestine called for an expenditure of about a half a million dollars a year since the time of its inception until today. In some years it has represented about half of the expenditures of American activities in Palestine. I do not intend to indulge in any personalities, and by way of preface I will say honestly and squarely that I do not accuse any single one of any group of men or women of dishonesty in any way, shape or manner. My criticisms, if such they may be, will merely be criticisms of policy. You have heard of all the organization committees that have been appointed in London to investigate and recommend the changes that ought to be made. To my best knowledge and belief the Reorganization Committee had no such a mission with regard to the American Zionist Medical Unit. Yet it is remarkable that with an institution which requires half a million dollars a year it should have taken for granted that everything connected with it is all right.

I will ask your indulgence for a few moments to tell you as briefly as I know how, a little about the history of the Unit. I will pass over the first year of the Unit with the remark that no matter what criticism may have been offered then and may be offered to-day about the activities and the results of the Unit during the first year of its work in Palestine, you will all agree with me that a body of men and women that had been organized during the World War, that had to travel at great sacrifice, that had to start and organize work in Palestine when the war was at its height, has done work which deserves a great deal of praise from everyone, and has earned our love and respect.

But with the termination and end of the war, the Unit had an entirely different problem before it.

The work of the Unit during the war was chiefly that of relief. We came to a war ridden country, poor and desolate, in many cities not a physician, not a nurse, not a man of medicine. It was our duty to supply them with all that we could, and we did it. We did the best that I believe any body of men and women could have done.

But when the war terminated, the problem that confronted the Unit, and still confronts it, was not the problem of relief work, but the problem of constructive work. Though relief work is not solved in Palestine, and probably will not be solved for a great many months to come, the constructive work of the Unit, the demands for constructive work in Palestine, so far overshadows relief work that that should be its main and only problem. As a member of the American Zionist Medical Unit it was my privilege to have done some work there, but one of my especial duties, at the request of the Zionist Commission and of the Executive Committee of the American Zionist Medical Unit, was to make a tour of investigation throughout entire Palestine, to investigate it from a medical sanitary point of view. We organized a commission of six physicians, three Palestinians and three members of the American Zionist Medical Unit, and for three months we traveled over the country, and visited every colony, every town, every institution, from the most northern part of Palestine to the southern part. We examined every child in Palestine from kindergarten age to high-school, and all of the entire

population, and we came to certain conclusions, as to what is most needed, not only for the present condition of Palestine, but for success in rebuilding our old homeland. As laymen and women, you are probably not interested in the technicalities of the medical conditions, but I will briefly tell you that over 60 per cent of the population in Palestine are afflicted with malaria in one form or another, and that perhaps a greater proportion of the children and the young of Palestine are afflicted with some form of eye disease, mostly expressing itself in trachoma. That is the place to which women and men are coming, to which we expect men and women to come from all over the world. This cannot be permitted until a body of medical men have prepared the country and at least instituted such means and methods as will prevent newcomers from falling victims to these two scourges in Palestine, malaria and trachoma. I have made a prediction then. I said that when the first batch of immigrants came, it would take two or three months and a good number of them would fall victims to malaria. To my great sorrow, that is what happened.

Now, the Unit is expending, as I told you, a half a million dollars a year, and let me tell you a half a million dollars a year is a considerable sum. For half a million dollars a year we ought to get some results. It is not enough that the Unit does a certain amount of work in Palestine. It is not enough that the Unit has a hospital here and there for relief work. The question is, does the Unit do the work that it should do now, and does it do enough work with the money that it is expending. It is my honest and sincere opinion that these two questions should be answered in the negative. The Unit does not do the work that it should do now, the Unit is not getting proportionate results for the money that it is expending.

At the last Buffalo Convention I spoke very briefly. At that time I did not have the distinction of being a delegate. I was merely a visitor, and had to ask for the courtesy of the floor, and in wanting to tell the delegates something of what I am telling you to-day I was restricted by the Chairman to a very brief space of time. I could not therefore say all that I wanted to. One gentleman, a delegate, had protested against certain remarks, and afterwards in a private conversation that I had I asked him, "How could you so grossly misunderstand me?" And his answer was, "I did not understand you, but the delegates might, and it was my duty to put the Unit right before the eyes of the delegates. Owing to the fact that perhaps we have made a mistake, I will help you introduce a resolution." A resolution was introduced by me then, and they had a committee appointed by the chair to investigate the Medical Unit and to recommend such changes as they might find necessary to the Executive Committee. That was at the Buffalo Convention. It took three months before the committee was ever appointed. It was only after repeated appeals, after repeated calls by the telephone and after repeated letters, calling the Chairman's attention to the fact that the Convention had instructed him to appoint a committee, that a committee was appointed. We were called before that committee, or at least I was, and in the discussion with the committee I presented my views and was requested to put down my views in a memorandum and to present it to that committee and they would take action as soon as possible. My views were presented on March 17th. I have no answer as yet to this day.

Now, fellow delegates, I ask you in all honesty and in all sincerity, is it right that an activity in Palestine, an institution in Palestine that represents half of the expenditure of the American Zionist Organization, that spends half a million dollars, should receive so little consideration when men believe honestly and sincerely that they have something to recommend?

I would take no issue with any person if my recommendations would have been rejected, if I would have been told that they were not proper, not fair and not needed. But to treat this matter in the way it has been treated, is, to say the least of it, something that should be brought to your attention. You say money is being spent, and you through whose efforts the money that is being spent is being gotten, should know that something is wrong.

I pointed out one cardinal fault with the Unit. I told you that I will not indulge in personalities. I am not going to criticize any individual physician or individual nurse. Most of them are laymen, like most of you, and you will understand that the American Unit that concerns itself chiefly with medical work, with sanitary work, should have at its head, a man at least familiar with medical work. You have never heard that, when the construction of a great bridge is to be begun, of a high-school teacher or a college professor being appointed as its director, however honorable a man he may be. You appoint an engineer who is competent to supervise the work of an iron bridge. In every other activity of life, especially in our country, efficiency has been much spoken of, and criticism has been hurled against other departments in Palestine, because of lack of efficiency. But I ask you in all sincerity and fairness, can you expect, have you the right to expect efficient management from a medical unit, the head of which is a man who, though he calls himself a doctor, himself declared openly before everyone that he never practiced medicine, that he does not know a thing about the practice of medicine? Yet that individual as a director in the Unit has sole power, power that no Czar in Russia had ever had, that no Sultan in Turkey has had. I ask you, is that fair? I ask you another thing. If one or two or three departments of the Unit happens to have done good work, can you credit a director of a management of a Unit with the good work that had been done? I tell you, No. This is merely a matter of chance and I will cite one instance, one of the greatest achievements of the Unit. It has been noted that there has been built a pathological institute at the head of which was a man perhaps known to you all, Dr. Roman. He was a man with a great reputation in Prague, originally from New York. This man was not engaged by the Medical Zionist Unit, but through one of the members his name was suggested, and after having done work that left its mark in Palestine and its mark with everyone who visited that pathological institute, that man was permitted to go, almost compelled to go, and no redress could be had because the director of the Unit has full power and apparently the full confidence of those who managed the destinies of the American Zionist Organization.

We have heard of immigrants, *Chaluzim*. It is not within the province of the doctor to be sentimental, and I am not going to be so, but besides being a doctor, I am a Jew and a Zionist. And I tell you that it is a crime, against the Chaluzim, to have tolerated a Unit that has done no single piece of constructive work for the institution of a system of medical sanitary aid to the Chaluzim.

The Chaluzim that came—should not have fallen victims to malaria in three months. I will tell you in a practical way what malaria means. Every working man in the colony is allowed to be sick 10 per cent of the time or 11 per cent of the time, for which his wages or salary is not deducted. This has been the rule in Palestine. Almost every man in Palestine loses more than 10 per cent of the time. Every working man lost out of every 10 days, at least one from malaria. These things could have been obviated if the Unit would have concentrated its work on this department. In a memorandum that I have presented with the aid of another gentleman who is perhaps more competent than myself, I have pointed out that for half a million dollars we could institute an anti-malaria system in Palestine which, we were both sure, could practically root out malaria—not the cause of malaria, but malaria itself. We could institute for the immigrant a system which would reasonably assure him from the day he arrived until he is settled and after that he will not fall a victim to malaria, we could have made an institution, a sort of a miniature Rockefeller Institution, as in New York, or like any other fine hospital in another part of America. We said we could do this for the same amount of money as you are spending there today, but that thing has not been done; not only has it not been done, but the proposition has not been given the courtesy of an answer from the last Buffalo convention until today, and today the thing remains as it was.

I bring this point out simply to call your attention to it—many statements have been made why this and that has been done was because the mandate was given at the last Buffalo convention. This was also a mandate, and I believe, a far more important one than any other. Why was it not carried out? If I or someone else come at some future time during this convention with a resolution that a reorganization of the Unit is absolutely essential, you will know the reason for the resolution. I shall better be able to answer any question on the resolution during the time of the introduction of the resolution. I thank you (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN introduced to the Convention Mr. Deutch, of Houston, Texas. In the introduction, the Chairman said, of Mr. Deutch: He is one of the Chaluzim: the oldest. Recently he sold out his properties in Houston, Texas, and has bought land in Palestine, and is going there to help make it a Jewish Homeland. I introduce him as the greatest product of Houston, Texas, in the one hundred years of its existence. (Applause.)

MR. ZELIGSON placed a resolution before the Convention that part of the Constitution of the Zionist Organization of America shall state that no individual could be its President for more than two years in succession. The Chairman informed Mr. Zeligson that this resolution would be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

The question of the resolutions being raised, Mr. Lipsky, speaking for the new majority in the Convention, begged the indulgence of the Convention for the committees still at work. He pointed out that the major part of the Convention had been taken up with finding out the will and purpose of the Zionist Organization with regard to matters of the greatest importance. As a result the Convention still had a clean slate before it as far as its business was concerned. The committees could not therefore have their business prepared in advance, as was usually the case.

MR. LIPSKY therefore suggested that the delegates make arrangements to stay over in Cleveland for another day, so that the business of the Convention could be completed in proper and dignified form. He begged the patience of the Convention for the various committees which, beside being tired with the strain of the Convention, had not the advantage of representing a previous administration, and therefore had to cut out their work from the beginning.

THE CHAIRMAN then called upon Dr. Mossinsohn to address the Convention.

DR. MOSSINSOHN: Never has the desire to speak been so strong in me as during the two days that I have sat and listened to the great debates on the problems of the Zionist World Organization and the American Federation. There was, however, a decision that the guests of the convention should take no part in the debates, and I was forced to remain silent. This decision was just, for it would be wrong to think that the contest at this convention was one between the World Zionists and the American Zionists. There was rather a double contest between the European or World Zionists and a part of the American organization, and, more than that, a contest between the large majority of the Zionists of America and the very small minority of their leaders. And it was for the American Zionists to carry on the fight alone. Now, after the fight, the problems of World Zionism come rightly to the fore, and it is connection with them, or at least a part of them, that I wish to speak.

Whenever I listened to the members of the former administration delivering long speeches about trifles, whenever I received their wires and telephone calls, I could not help feeling that they were doing themselves an injustice. For them, too, there were deeper issues at stake than the trifling questions they discussed.

When we examine in their entirety the three documents round which the fight has been waged—the demands of the American leaders in London, the Report of the Reorganization Committee and the famous last Memorandum—we perceive the difference of principle in the Zionist outlook between the World Zionists and the American minority group.

The questions involved are fundamental: they are the questions of the powers of the World Organization, the character of our work and of our rôle in Palestine and our relation to the cultural work in the revival of the Jewish spirit.

The first two problems will undoubtedly be the themes for my older colleagues and leaders: Dr. Weizmann will speak on the first, and Mr. Ussischkin on the second. My own speech will therefore be a short one, and will be devoted to the third problem.

The effort to liquidate the only territorial organizations of the Central Zionist Organization constitutes a danger to the representative rôle which is played by the World Organization, and that at a time when that rôle should be at its height. Our political work has not come to an end; it has only just begun. The Balfour Declaration and the San Remo decision were granted to the Zionist Organization only for the Jewish people. But as soon as our concept of a Jewish people is allowed to weaken, as soon as, for one reason or another, we allow our flag to droop, the opportunity is given our political opponents to say that there is no Jewish people, that there is no one to whom to give Palestine. And if there is no international Zionist Organization, there is no one to represent the Jewish people.

Still more dangerous is the desire for separatism in Palestine. Very little will be achieved if every Federation were to begin work in Palestine on its own account, on its own responsibility, after its own fashion. What would be achieved would be the old communities, with their old divisions. There would be the poor community, and then the well-to-do Hungarian community, and then the very wealthy American community. And here I come to the second point: if, as I have said, the political work of the Zionist World Organization is only just beginning, the work of the organization in Palestine is assuredly in its infancy. And in regard to this work we must be on our guard. It would be wrong to think that the government of Sir Herbert Samuel today fulfils the Zionist ideal. With the best intentions in the world, Sir Herbert Samuel could not do this. His government is the government of the country, and in the country we are a minority. What Sir Herbert Samuel does strengthens the country as a whole, that is to say, strengthens our neighbors seven times more than it strengthens us. The Zionist Organization must conduct its own policy in the country until the day when we shall be a majority. When the Jewish population of Palestine presents a request to the government, it does so in the name of a small minority which may be taken into account or disregarded. But the Zionist Commission, in making a request, makes it in the name of fourteen million Jews, whose right to become citizens of Palestine whenever they desire has been recognized by San Remo. And then the Zionist Commission speaks in the name of a tremendous majority, which cannot be disregarded. Should we, through fear of words, through fear of such phrases as "A state within a State" and so on, relinquish our power, we would be relinquishing the only advantage we have won with San Remo. This is why we were so bitterly opposed to the demands of the American group to do away with the political character of the Zionist Commission. As I have said, I do not wish to defend the work of the Zionist Commission. That will be Mr. Ussischkin's duty and privilege. I do not feel myself competent to judge the economic side of the work, but one thing I do feel, and that is that it is ridiculous to speak of wasteful expenditure when every piece of work that called for funds was blocked by the lack of them. One aspect of the work I do not want to touch. A sound economic basis for the Jews of Palestine is a necessity, and not only do we admit this, but we feel and demand it more than others, for Palestine is to be our home, and it stands to reason that we should desire that our home should be strong and self-reliant; but there must be a strong spiritual foundation before the building can be raised. This was what the American group understood least of all. When I came back to Palestine two years ago, returning from exile, I found such chaos in the country, such ruin, such contempt for the Zionist Commission, which was then under American leadership, that I was really terrified. I did not recognize the Palestine I had left. Then Mr. Ussischkin came to Palestine. There began the era of the Zionist Commission which has been so bitterly attacked. Mr. Ussischkin entered into the most intimate aspects of the life of Palestine Jewry. They were not always in agreement with him. He had many opponents, who attacked him on many grounds, for it was felt that here was one who stood inside the life of Palestine and not outside. He did not deal as a superior with the Jews of Palestine, treating them as aborigines, natives—a word which we learned in Palestine under the American administration. This was the

feeling that embittered everyone against the American administration and against everything they did, the feeling that in everything they dealt with us as with natives.

In the last two years, out of the struggles that took place, either round the Zionist Commission, or against it, a feeling of confidence in the Commission slowly grew. It became the centre of Jewish life in Palestine, and under its influence and with its help, was born and grew the gathering of representatives, the Palestinian Parliament, in the election of which 87 per cent of the Jewish population, the old and the new, took part, and this despite the fact that a certain group which at once leans upon and supports the former American administration, made every effort to prevent its growth, going even so far as official complaints against that body. And now Palestinian Jewry is properly organized. Perhaps the value of this cannot be measured in dollars and cents, but in the construction of a nation this fact is above all valuation, is the very foundation of the future.

A good deal must remain incomprehensible to those whose sole measure is the dollar. I must touch on the calculation made by Dr. Wise, that two plus two is four, and two minus three is minus one, which means a deficit of one, and it is this deficit which fills him with fear. This theory is absolutely faultless for minor, everyday purposes. And yet I must tell Dr. Wise that in Palestine it has happened that a minus of several thousand pounds has given such an impulse to our national life, that money cannot measure it. One of the disputed questions was that of the Kwuzoth, which had constant deficits. I do not know whether the Kwuzoth are a proper form of colonization or not. This is a question which experts must decide. But if by our annual deficits we created an army of thousands of Jewish land laborers which might otherwise not have been brought into existence, then we have gained something for our national life which is worth the deficits it cost and more. For economy does not mean such close counting of every fraction of a cent that at the first alarm all supplies are to be stopped: it means the envisaging of the problem as a whole, a larger calculation of what is and what is not worth while. We are not opposed to a healthy business instinct as applied to Zionism; it is to that unhealthy business instinct, that petty, peddling instinct which is not business at all, that we are opposed.

There is another remark of Dr. Wise's that I must touch on—that in regard to the Russification of Palestine. Friend Goldberg has already answered him that it is not our fault that it was mostly Russian Jews that came to Palestine to build up the country, while other Jews waited—and are still waiting. But there is another remark I want to make. It is true that the newcomers from Russia speak Russian until they learn Hebrew, but they have never made a cult of it, they have never founded an institution which they have called a Russian institution. You will not find a single institution which issues any kind of document in Russian. They learn Hebrew instead: they overcome the bitterest difficulties, and create in Hebrew. The only ones to introduce separatism were of the American medical group, with its American Medical Unit, where all the writing was done in English, where a struggle had to be waged for every Hebrew word, a struggle in which the threat of boycott was heard. There is no danger of Russification in Palestine. There is only the danger of the creation of an English-American-Jewish aristocracy, which will look down on the natives of Palestinian Jewry. But this convention has broken with that policy and I believe that that danger is past.

I come now to the cultural question and the question of Zionist work. At the London Conference the American group demanded that the school item on the budget should be decreased and removed from the budget of the Zionist Organization. If the Jews of Palestine want schools for their children, let them build them. If they have not the money, then they must limit their educational plans until they have the money. They might perhaps be permitted to send representatives through various countries to gather money for their schools. But that has nothing to do with the Zionist Organization. This point of view is repeated in the report of the Reorganization Committee and in the Memorandum. It appears that for these gentlemen this was a cardinal question. And this opposition to the cultural work of Zionism is thoroughly consistent with their outlook as a whole on Zionism, with their policy of limitation, with their efforts to translate a great national movement into a list of innocent institutions in Palestine.

One of the principal arguments against the cultural work in Palestine was that when the Pilgrim Fathers came to America they had no one to build schools for them, that what they could they did, and England, the mother country, was disinterested in the question. This may be true, but one thing has been forgotten in this argument, namely that there is a vast difference between English immigrants of the seventeenth century and Jewish immigrants of the twentieth century. Moreover the Pilgrim Fathers, it must be remembered, left behind them a mighty culture, a culture in full bloom, a culture which could be to them a source of spiritual nourishment for many years. They could perhaps afford to ignore the question of schools, though it is wrong to say that they did, for they began building schools at once. But what have the Jewish immigrants who are now coming to Palestine left behind them? They have left behind them a people in ruins, a people in the throes of dissolution. They have no source from which to draw spiritual nourishment. On the contrary, it is they who must create a source from which the Diaspora must be nourished. We do not look on Palestine as a country which serves as an asylum for persecuted Jews; it is rather the land of the rebirth of the Jewish people. Zionism is the process of this rebirth, and to remove the cultural element in Zionism means to remove the soul from the body, so that the new Jewry shall be as a dead-born child.

Even now the lands of the Diaspora are drawing spiritual nourishment from Palestine. If the Jews of Poland, of Galicia and even of Ukraine, far from abandoning their Hebrew schools, are actually developing them and adding to them, it is thanks to the progress which the Hebrew language has made in Palestine. It is an old truth, one which it should be superfluous to allude to, that even here such success as you have encountered in keeping your children true to the Jewish people has been made possible by the influence of Palestinian work. So that the Palestinian schools are not built merely for the ninety or one hundred thousand Jews who are in Palestine, and not they are the ones bound to bear the burden: the burden should be borne by those who have at heart the renaissance of the Jewish people—the Zionist Organization. The Zionist Organization aims at the cultural revival of the Jews of all countries, if only for the reason that whoever comes to Palestine shall in some measure have been prepared for that country. If 80 per cent of the Chaluзим who have come to Palestine not only understood but actually spoke Hebrew, they strength-

ened our position in the country, and did not weaken it, as was feared at first. We should in fact be organizing cultural work in the Diaspora, but there is no money for that purpose, and it would be ridiculous to raise that question in connection with the Keren Hayesod, because not a cent of that money can be spent otherwise than in Palestine.

It is possible that the American group could not or would not understand the significance of the cultural work. But there this work has a second aspect—the political aspect—and, since they do claim to understand political questions, they should have understood this.

We are a minority in the country, and many worthy, honest people, who have leanings towards Zionism, come to Palestine and ultimately join the ranks of our opponents. We saw this happen amongst the British representatives as well as with the former American Commission. They note that the Arabs are a great majority, that they are at work and that they are rooted in the country and they ask whether the historic rights of the Jewish people really constitute a claim to the country, even for the future. But when they become acquainted with our cultural institutions, when they see what we have achieved in so short a time and with such limited means, when they learn how, under impossible circumstances, we have exerted great spiritual influence on the revival of the country, then they concede that our claim is a just one, for in the rebuilding of a country not only the number but the value of individuals counts. The great majority of Arabs has not been able to create in hundreds of years what has been created in thirty years by the insignificant minority of Jews. And this is proof positive that the Jews are capable of rebuilding the country, and the same applies to our cultural work, not in the schools but amongst adults, and particularly amongst the newly arrived working classes. Without Hebrew they remain strangers in their own country, strangers to each other. Only when they are taught, and at their own demand, the Hebrew language, are they drawn into the powerful body of the country. The Jewish working man must compete with the native born worker who is innured to the climate and to the difficult conditions of the country, and whose primitive culture reduces his demands to a minimum. We do not wish to lower the standard of the Jewish worker, and it is the desire of the Jewish worker to increase and broaden his education, so that his work might gain, might become more expert, thus entitling him to higher recompense. Our cultural work is the economic basis for the creation and support of a Jewish working class in the country.

We have the right to demand from the Jewish worker every sacrifice in the world except one—the sacrifice of his intellect and education. And indeed, this one sacrifice would render him incapable of bringing us any other.

Those who previously demanded the cessation of immigration in the name of economy later asked for the cessation of cultural work in the name of immigration. But the immigrants, in whose name this demand was ostensibly made, had only one thought when they descended from the ship: before they had found a place of rest for themselves, they made it their business to find schools for their children, and the workers in the Kvishim were prepared to live in tents, were prepared to put up with every hardship—but one thing they insisted on having—teachers. And out of their meagre wages—I make this remark in passing—they paid 40 per cent of the expenses of their education.

When the question of Hebrew as the third language in the country was raised in the British Parliament, a Member of the House pointed to the great budget of our schools as proof of the importance of the question of Hebrew to the Zionist Organization, and in this way was saved the first of the political rights we had won. The Arabs understood what the American group failed to understand: they came to the Government with a demand for schools. They demanded 300 village schools and three gymnasiums or high schools. This is almost twice as much as we possess. In this domain too they wish to have the majority, and had we followed our "politicians" and closed the schools, we would have undermined with our own hands our strongest position in the country. One moment more: Palestine is the centre of attraction for many associations, Jewish and non-Jewish. When the schools were united into a single body, under the Zionist Organization, we succeeded in instituting a single language, and a single policy in line with the revival of the Jewish people. Should the Zionist Organization remove its controlling hand from the school system of the country, it would break at once into countless fragments, return to the chaos from which it has emerged. And the "soul snatchers," the missionaries, they have funds enough, they are prepared to look after every child that is left on the streets with the closing down of a Jewish school. (Loud applause.)

The London Conference, by a large majority, officially accepted a budget which would ensure a school for every Jewish child in Palestine, and at the same time increased the pay of the teacher, so that he might at least be certain of his daily bread for himself and his family. Under pressure from the American leaders, who threatened that they would not give a cent unless they were listened to, the Executive so far reduced the budget that the teachers remained at their previous starvation pay, and more than one thousand Jewish children were either to remain on the streets or go to the missionary schools where they would be brought up as our enemies in the land. The Palestinian teachers, to the number of five hundred, then resolved, despite the treatment accorded them, to devote two hours apiece every week without remuneration. Thus one thousand hours a week were to be devoted to these children, so that not one of them might be left without a Jewish school.

You American Zionists have sinned. In our despair we appealed to you at the Buffalo convention, but you let yourselves be misled and our cry remain unnoticed and unanswered. Now, seeing your error, it has cost you a bitter struggle before you could return to the true Zionism, the Zionism which enfolds within itself the whole of the Jewish revival.

The struggle was a bitter one, but it was crowned with victory. Your feet are planted again on the true path. Go forward on that path, for it leads to the renaissance of the Jewish people.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have heard during this Convention a great deal about the Keren Hayesod. You have heard about the Directors of the Keren Hayesod. We are fortunate to have with us the President of the Board of Trustees of the Keren Hayesod, Mr. Naiditch.

MR. NAIDITCH (speaking in Yiddish) reviewed the work of the Keren Hayesod in Europe, and expressed the hope that American Jewry would rise to the historic occasion and take its full share in the hope. The Keren Hayesod, he pointed out, represented the future of Jewish Palestine. Referring to the controversy regarding the status of the Keren

Hayesod, Mr. Naiditch explained that the present statutes were provisional; there was no question of superseding the authority of the World Zionist Organization, of which the Keren Hayesod was only the instrument.

THE CHAIRMAN: The brunt of the criticism in this Convention was directed against the Palestine Commission, and not so much against the Palestine Commission generally as against the Chairman of the Palestine Commission. I am sure that he above all should be given the opportunity to present to this Convention the work of the Palestine Commission. I take pleasure in presenting Mr. Ussischkin.

MR. USSISCHKIN (speaking in Yiddish):

Much has been said here about the working program of the Zionist Organization in Palestine. I am concerned chiefly with our practical tasks in the country. For that reason I regard everything that already exists in Palestine and which has been created through our efforts as worth while, without regard to their desirability. It is for that reason that I have supported the Kwutzah system, the system of co-operative agricultural groups despite the fact I am not an adherent of the economic principle underlying the creation of the Kwutzah. But here we are faced with something that actually exists. Those groups are very important as strategic points in our colonization. It is due to them that the territory which was disputed by the French was finally included in the Palestine boundary. I am speaking of the territory lying north of the Sea of Galilee, as far up as Methulah, which would not have been included in our boundaries if not for the co-operative groups at Tel-Hai, K'far Gileadi and Hamara and the valorous defense which was put up by Trumpledor and his men during the Bedouin attack upon these groups, and Metullah, in March, 1920.

It is from that point of view that we welcome every constructive activity which protects our acquisition and enriches our holdings, no matter where, and no matter under what circumstances. We cannot be fastidious and say that we insist on this or that form of settlement. Our work has not as yet evolved from the experimental stage. The fact that we have two such diametrically opposed systems of colonization as the old colonies and the new groups should not therefore be a matter of grief to us.

I hold the same view with regard to the acquisition of land in Palestine. My colleagues and I have been charged with making the purchase of land in the Emek Jezreel under conditions which were not so favorable, and without the proper authority. My answer is, that while the criticism may be true in this or that respect, the fact remains that we have acquired that extremely valuable piece of land, which would otherwise not have been acquired. (Applause.) I do not know whether the price we paid per dunam for that land was excessive or not. We are not out to buy Palestine at an auction sale, by trying to underbid a competitor. Here was this fertile stretch of land, and the opportunity to acquire it. We purchased it at the lowest possible price, and under conditions as favorable as we could obtain. As to the question of authority, I wish to make it quite clear that my colleagues and I hastened with the negotiations because we knew that the gentlemen of the Reorganization Commission who were then on their way to Palestine would have cancelled the purchase if they could. We were the representatives of the

Jewish National Fund in Palestine and it was our duty to avail ourselves of every advantageous offer. Therein lay our authority which we, without waiting for the formal approval of the Reorganization Commission, made use of in the interests of our cause.

A very serious charge levelled at me and my colleagues of the Zionist Commission was the alleged "diversion of trust funds." Those who make this charge do so without considering the actual situation in Palestine. We out there have our daily tasks and our daily problems—tasks and problems which cannot wait upon the dispensation of any man or group of men. These obligations have to be met and we have tried to meet them as best we knew how. When Chaluzim arrive we have to receive them, care for them, give them their tools and send them to places of employment. The money for this is not always forthcoming, and we naturally make use of whatever funds are available at the moment, always with the view of repaying it. If this be diversion of funds, I plead guilty of such misdemeanor. Here again, I say, we cannot be fastidious. The realities, the needs, the urgent calls upon our limited resources prevent us, should prevent anybody, from being over squeamish. Not only we, but anyone in our place in Palestine, earnestly seeking to discharge the tremendous responsibility, would have also borrowed from one source or another. As a matter of record it should be stated that our predecessors on the Zionist Commission, the American gentlemen who were in charge before my arrival, have acted in the same way, and not a word of criticism has come from anyone.

When I arrived in Jerusalem, I found that the Zionist Commission had incurred such heavy debts with the Anglo-Palestine Company that I, in my capacity as a director of the Anglo-Palestine Company, had to shut off further credit to the Zionist Commission of which I was the head. I am not criticising the gentlemen who incurred that debt, because I am certain that the very precarious position in which they found themselves called for heavy expenditure; but I expect the same fairness from those who would examine our activities, and pass judgment upon them; I say, moreover, that whoever is in charge of the work in Palestine will have to use whatever funds are available if our self-respect is to be maintained. And I shall continue to do so, if I should again find myself placed in this unfortunate position because of lack of support.

Whoever goes to Palestine to direct the work of the Zionist Commission must be acceptable to the Jewish people in Palestine. Among other things, he must have a knowledge of the Hebrew language. He should be close to the Jewish spirit. Of course, it is essential that he should be *persona grata* with the Palestine Government. But it is infinitely more essential that he should be *persona grata* with the Jewish people. Given the choice between the two men, one of whom is acceptable to the Jewish people but not so pleasing to the powers that be, I would unhesitatingly select the one who is the choice of the Jewish interests. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure that you have all been awaiting the opportunity to hear the President of the World Zionist Organization, who will now address us. President Chaim Weizmann. (Applause.)

DR. CHAIM WEIZMANN: Mr. Chairman and fellow Zionists. I would have liked to see in this hall those gentlemen who spoke yesterday at great

length and with great eloquence. I might say at the outset that I am reluctantly compelled to answer certain points which were made yesterday. I do it not so much in order to justify myself in your eyes, although I would consider that also necessary—and I think I am perfectly prepared to give account for my actions before the next Congress, but I think the tale I am going to tell is perhaps interesting, as one which throws a light on a chapter in our movement which I think the historian will find it worth while to register. And as yesterday people have been speaking for records I may be permitted to record certain things.

I am sorry that we are all worn out and perhaps I shall not be in a position to do justice to you or to myself. I apologize also beforehand that I shall have to quote myself rather more often than I would like to do, but so much has been spoken about the leadership of the World Zionist Organization yesterday that I am compelled in my reply to refer to myself.

With great patience, under very considerable provocation, I sat yesterday and listened carefully to all that had been said, and to much which has been left unsaid. I shall not refer to those things which were unsaid, and which come to my ears almost every minute. I shall consider that this is the dust and the mud which is necessarily thrown up during a battle. Those who work in the Jewish street, in any street, have got to make up their mind that mud and dust will have to cover them at a certain stage of their life.

I regret particularly that Rabbi Wise is unavoidably absent. There is not much I would like to refer to in his speech, except two words which rather startled me. I don't know whether the assembly noticed them. He said that it is a delicate matter and I would like to touch upon it as delicately as one possibly can. He said in one breath "of course we have confidence in Great Britain" but he said in the same breath "of course we expect that it is not going to be a British Crown Colony." When has it been suggested either directly or indirectly either by word or in writing, by any British statesman or any Zionist co-operating with the British statesmen that there is any idea or any shadow of an idea that Palestine is to become a British Crown Colony? The very fact that it is very necessary to emphasize a denial raises suspicion in the mind of an ordinary man. Why has it been done? What for? What is behind it all? If there is a suspicion I think the best way is to tell the British Government that we, the Jews, including the British Jews, we don't want Palestine to be a British Colony. It is a mandatory territory and such it will remain, and the master of Palestine is the League of Nations. It is easy to speak openly and frankly. Least of all, we should talk with the British Government or with any other Government by insinuation or innuendo. The one power we possess is to be frank and outspoken and the government understands. Leave it to others to be diplomatic.

This is also applicable to the second statement that we shall elect as our leaders those whom the Zionist Organization elects. What does that mean, by innuendo? Are we agents of the British Government or Zionist leaders?

I shall pass over these points, which are weighty, which are mighty, and I will advise our friends, the opponents, to touch upon those things with tender fingers. It is easy to spoil, very easy, ladies and gentlemen. At no time in the world's history was it so necessary that the relations

between these two great nations should be clear, crystal clear, and we must be the last people to trouble these nations. I am sure Rabbi Wise meant well. I am sure that in the heat of the polemics he did not consider what consequence might be drawn from his words, not by us, because we know Rabbi Wise, but by the others who read it in the papers.

All the speeches on our side, so to say, have touched upon the question of reorganization of Palestine, and I think the proper reply has been given by Goldberg and by Mossinsohn. Let me add one word more, I know modern Palestine fairly well, and both in my reports and in private conversation, particularly with members of the British Government, I point to the danger that in Palestine an Anglo-Levantine or an American-Levantine Colony is being created which does not fit into the system of Palestine and I regret doubly that our American friends, not through their own faults, contributed greatly to the form of this Anglo-Levantine Colony. Of course one has one's troubles in Palestine on account of the fact that we have to prove and fight our way for Hebrew. Hebrew is not only the vehicle of national thought in Palestine. Hebrew is also a mighty political instrument, and if there were no Hebrew schools you would not have had inserted in the mandate that Hebrew is one of the languages of the country and you would not be able to see Hebrew on the stamps and on the tickets and the railroad carriages; and if you want to do your first duty, our first duty, is that we should speak Hebrew.

And therefore, I can understand very well why, when I arrived first in Palestine and told my Palestinian friends, "Gentlemen, I know Hebrew, but I cannot speak it yet," they very politely and firmly told me, "Dr. Weizmann, we shall allow you once to speak in another language. Afterwards you have no right to do it."

I bowed before it and since then I have never opened my mouth publicly in Palestine in another language than Hebrew. (Applause.)

I am a busy man. I have got to do so and I would advise everybody who goes to Palestine either to keep quiet or to learn Hebrew when he wants to speak to Palestinian Jews. It is an education which we have got to go through. It is unpleasant, but many of the things we have have got to do are unfortunately unpleasant and if life in Palestine were so pleasant, perhaps Palestine would not be ours.

Great emphasis has been laid by Rabbi Wise on the services which have been rendered by the American Leaders to the Zionist Cause. This emphatic statement reminds me very much of the constant emphasis which is laid on the fact that we or you are good Americans, as though somebody has ever denied the enormous service which those gentlemen have rendered, as if there was an occasion, public and private, where attempts were made in any way directly or indirectly to mitigate the services which they have rendered. All honor to them. Of course they have rendered sterling service. Of course, at a time of trouble and crisis we could fall back on them and they always answered the call in every way. Nobody has ever denied it. I shall be the last man to do it or try to take off one iota of the enormous service which they have rendered. But I think it was unnecessary. We know it. We have done it. We are not here to pay each other compliments. But speaking of that, perhaps you will permit me to get rid of a legend, one of the many, one of the hundreds, upon which I cannot seize, but I can seize upon this. Nothing turns on it, but as we are speaking for records, the truth may be recorded.

It is said, it is circulated, that the Balfour Declaration was framed here, was made here, that the text of this declaration was really framed here. There is not a vestige of truth in that statement. This is all I have to say. The Balfour Declaration was framed by Lord Milner and by his secretary and the original text of the Balfour Declaration as it is at present standing is in the archives of the British Government. That is really all that I have to say so far as the speech of Rabbi Wise is concerned. The other things were in my humble opinion perfectly irrelevant. But the burden of the argument and the center of the argument was the speech of Prof. Frankfurter, his grave charges, grave accusations, facts, and nothing but facts. I shall turn to these facts. I shall turn to these accusations, but I would like to preface my remark with one thing. The very same speech, almost to an iota, I heard about a fortnight ago. It lasted almost the same time. I replied to this speech. I think there is one maybe in the audience who has heard the same speech. She might have heard my reply. Surely, surely, if one is out for the interest of truth, some corrections might have been inserted in the second edition of the speech. (Laughter.)

But it was found not necessary. The speech was so beautifully rehearsed that any corrections might have disturbed the harmony or the purpose for which the speech was made.

But before I come to these facts and you shall hear them, I would like to tell my story, which is a tale of woe, which is part of Zionist history. Much has been said about the attitude of my friend, Julius Simon. He is my friend and at this time I stand on the ruins of two or three very great friendships, and it is not easy for a man in my lifetime to lose friends. Moreover, I need all the friends I can get. It was your humble servant that during the war, in the year 1918, before I left for Palestine, made every possible effort to get Julius Simon to England. There is a man here who knows that. I went to the British Government. I told the British Government, "This man whom I ask you to bring is technically an American, but in fact a German, during the war. He has been out of Germany since 1916. I need him. We need him. We are going away to Palestine. There is nobody here who should look to Zionist affairs. I can guarantee his character"; and on the strength of this guarantee, during the war, Mr. Simon was sent over to London. When I returned from Palestine (I think this is interesting, ladies and gentlemen), when I returned from Palestine (it was perhaps a month before the armistice, I returned from Palestine in October, the armistice was on the 11th of November), I told Simon, whom I then saw for the first time, "Julius, you have one chance to pull through. (We then believed that the mandate might come very soon.) If the mandate is issued on the first of January, 1920, you must tell me what you are ready to do on the second of January, 1920," because, I told him, we, Sokolow and myself, will engage in a political battle. "We have no time and no possibility to think of all the problems. We have no knowledge of them. You have been sitting in The Hague together with other friends. You have been thinking, working, working out these problems. It is your duty to see that we are ready to begin work when the time comes."

You know that much water flowed in the various rivers since the armistice until the granting of the mandate. The mandate is not granted

yet. This gentleman had time to work out these problems and whenever through the various wanderings I had to make, oscillating constantly between Palestine and anywhere, today Paris, tomorrow London, after tomorrow somewhere else, Jerusalem, a few intervals which were given to me, I was constantly inquiring, "Are we all right, do we know what the colonization plans are, what the financial plans are, and what our policy of reconstruction in Palestine is going to be?" And I see in our office in London tremendous activity, people thinking, working, elaborating problems. Simon was put in charge of the Palestine Department. He conducted his department for two years, and I say what I said to Mr. Simon in a letter which has been published, that not a single definite plan, definite idea, definite product of reconstruction had been prepared.

After San Remo I repeated this slogan. I said, "Now we are approaching the treaty of Sevres, which may be ratified any day. Lloyd George has asked us that we should speedily begin work. Samuel is being sent to Palestine. It will break Samuel if he won't work. Make ready. Strip for action." And I insisted upon Simon going to America, and he went to America for reasons which you can quite understand. Not only as it was said yesterday to get dollars in America, but to get Jews, to get ideas. I believed that here were men full of experience and ideas, and incidentally money. And now the tragedy begins.

When he arrived, I asked him, "What is the news? Are you ready?" And the one reply and answer as you have heard was, "Zionism in America is going down. There is apathy. There is no money." I don't know he said whether even the budget, the miserable little budget which we needed for Palestine, whether this can be gathered, whether the quota which America is giving, a respectable quota in proportion to the budget, whether this will be forthcoming. In vulgar language, nothing doing. And here I was proudly promising Lloyd George, "The Jews will reply." My messenger comes back from America with this sinister message, and I told him, "Simon, I don't believe you. You have not seen the Jews. It is impossible. It is a discouraging position. I shall go. And I said to him, it will be a journey of Columbus to rediscover the Jews of America." (Applause.) Please do not interrupt me. I think we are writing the history of Zionism. Shortly after his return, there was this famous and fatal London conference. I think there was not much distance between them. I may not be quite correct in the dates. Forgive me. I cannot describe to you, indeed I cannot describe with what eagerness, I awaited to see the American delegates. It meant everything. Everything was based on the message they would bring. After San Remo, when I asked to start work, Samuel was out. He was pressing for a loan, from banks, he said for instance, and he is a very clever man in what he says. He said, "I shall open the register in Palestine. People will be able to buy land. I expect 15, 20, 25 Jewish companies coming and presenting themselves to buy land."

All that I knew and carried with me and I waited and waited more than an orthodox Jew waits for the Messiah, for the arrival of the American Delegation.

They arrived. We had the first meeting of the American Delegation, and I would like anyone here who was at this meeting to record what happened. Not a word of encouragement. Not a word of what

is going to happen. Nothing, nothing, nothing, except a very solemn declaration, "No money. I don't think you have a budget." American Jews don't give; bankruptcy. Is it so or is it not? And again I repeat, I don't know America. I have never been there, but I cannot believe it. It is impossible for me to believe and under the pressure of these events, work began. The conference began. Reference was made here in a veiled form that a plan was brought from America, not a plan how to colonize Palestine, not a program, but a plan how to build up an executive in London. Possibly it was a good plan. Possibly it was a bad plan. When all the facts about this plan will be forthcoming, I may be permitted to speak about them. But it was said that one member of the executive has wrecked this plan. The wrecker of this plan was myself. Why? What was the plan, in what did it consist, let it be said, and then I will reply.

But it was considered preferable only to insinuate something and therefore I say if the word wrecking is applicable to this action, well, well, I think that I can answer for this action. I shall not dwell on the history of the London Conference. The records of it are known. It has been spoken and it has been read about, but finally after great perturbation the executive was created. The desire was to create a homogeneous executive, but a homogeneous executive was an impossibility, and from that moment, from the day since this executive was created—and please listen to what I have got to say—I was not the leader of the Zionist Organization, at least as far as inside leadership was concerned, but I became the prisoner of the Zionist Organization. I was the one man who could not resign. I was the one man who could not afford to say, "I take no responsibility." I was the one man on whose shoulders the crushing burden was laid and I was sent to work with my hands tied, without money, without friends, with an American Organization broken up and disintegrated. There was Samuel waiting, pledged to the British Government, waiting and waiting, without a budget for the daily routine work in Palestine, and the only program which was given by your leaders at the end of the conference after San Remo was "Cut down expenses." That is my business. These are the auspices under which I began work. Confidence in the Organization shattered, no financial support, a stream of criticism, destructive, unhelpful, half ignorant, pouring out from every paper. Satisfaction was demanded, fired and shot at from five different fractions, so that even a sympathetic outsider had to cry out at one public meeting in London; he said, "Do not shoot at the Organist who is trying to do his best." Why, why this decision? Why this demoralization, dry rot, which set into an organization when the organization was at the height of its achievements? Why was it done? I have and I formulate here a definite accusation, a definite charge, not before the convention, but before the bar of history. American leadership did not understand the moment. They failed to grasp it. And that is the tragedy of the situation. They lost faith in their own supporters. Therefore they came to Europe and told us "Bankruptcy," instead of coming to us with plans, with men, or telling us, come and help us to give these plans and means. These very gentlemen who rendered yeoman service during the war when the business consisted in negotiating with governments, with non-Jews, have proved a failure when the

business consisted in negotiating with Jews. Here lies a great truth. It is not their fault. It is perhaps the fault of their education. It is perhaps the tragedy of Jewish life, yet here it was and it came out for the first time. I felt it. Powerful as they might have been in speaking to the non-Jews, they were powerless when they had to face the power which mattered, that is, the Jewish people, and that is the only people which began to matter after San Remo. And here began *Haverah Gorereth Haverah*, and here began the degradation of our movement, as there were no means, as there was no Jewish people, then they had to create a program which fitted that occasion. One had to cut the Zionist Program to suit circumstances. If there is no money, you cannot build anything in Palestine. If there is no money for schools, schools cannot be built. If there is no money for immigrants, no immigrants. And the whole program consisted in *do taase*, in things which cannot be done, in things which should not be done, and, perhaps to justify the policy of negation, Palestine has been criticized to death. What we have done is bad and therefore don't do anything at all. And one standing in the midst of a tragedy having been saddled with the responsibility, with faults in our educational system, in our colonization and our administrative program. To these critics I would like to quote the language of the achievements in Palestine of a man whom they certainly all respect. When in the year 1914 Baron Rothschild returned from Palestine, I asked him, "Baron Rothschild, you have been in Palestine in your life five times. You have seen the good and bad of Palestine. You have lived there and you have created half of it or more. Tell me what you think of it!" And he said, "Dr. Weizmann, I will tell you quickly in one sentence what it is. Without me, you Zionists would perhaps have done very little in Palestine, but without you my work would have been dead." That was the reply given by Baron De Rothschild. (Applause.)

Of course the state of affairs did not improve during the war. Compare this reply and compare the criticism of the man who has made half of Palestine, who has sunk his enthusiasm, many years of his life and a great deal of his wealth into Palestine, with the criticism which we have here. One can criticize lovingly as one criticizes one's own child and one can give criticism as an outsider—God knows I have been a critic myself. I know what criticism is, but when we were criticizing Herzl, afterwards, when the congress finished, we went out into the Jewish street and worked and worked for the same work that we have been criticizing. I have still a letter of Herzl where he wrote to me saying, quoting the French proverb—one leans on the things which resist, and he could lean on us. For what we have criticized, we have worked for, we have criticized lovingly our own creations and we took the responsibility. But the result of this criticism was only one, the confidence in everything, the last vestige of confidence which was left, was shaken to the ground.

These were the auspices under which work began nine months ago. Is it to be wondered at that everything was stagnant here? Is it to be wondered at that only ten thousand Chaluzim came into Palestine? It is a miracle that so many have come in. Do you know what a nightmare it is, the budget of Palestine? Do you know what a nightmare it is that we have to hunt about through every corner and find, and don't

know where the next two thousand pounds are going to come from, when Ussischkin wires and wires and I knew that if he does not get the money in time it will mean starvation, literally starvation for the best of our people, and, your leader who had to watch over the boundaries every minute, was transformed into a shadow, who had to go about from community to community to beg five thousand pounds, and you desire the British Government to respect us! It is a good thing that they did not know everything, but now you should know. What did we get from the other side, from here, where there is wealth, where there is sympathy, where there is a Jewish community, desirous of working for Palestine. I know it now. A miserable seven thousand pounds a month. That is all, and plenty of good advice and any amount of criticism.

Under these circumstances, I worked with a broken up executive, homogeneous executive, with Julius Simon, my dear friend, and De Lieme, whom I respect, and were not the chosen agents of the Zionist Organization. They were imposed on the Zionist Organization and I did the imposing. I did the imposing. I did it because I had to do it. I imposed upon the Actions Committee, I bent the will of the Actions Committee, I said there is a superior will to that and the Actions Committee went away broken up. Is it a wonder that these sinister usurpers, Naiditch and Slatopolsky were broken-hearted and dissatisfied, when they were transformed in your eyes into monsters, desiring to get power; God knows you can have this power to-day if you would only take and break my shackles. The Keren Hayesod was stagnant, obstructed, because no instructions came from America. We did not know exactly what America was going to think about it. America was not in a hurry. Everything is regular in America. Convention is to be called in due time. Damn Palestine and the rest as long as everything is regular, and I committed another irregularity, I had to set off the Keren Hayesod. The executive was an impossibility, an impossibility. Sokolow away, Simon in The Hague, and I traveling about; and sometimes Simon, in order to get a quorum, had to place himself before the mirror to have an illusion that there is another man present. They were good devoted men and in connection with that I would like to mention the name of a man, who, I think, has been unjustly treated here. Although I disagree with his views, Benjamin Cohen, who rendered good, excellent service, devotedly, always, always, working, was placed in a wrong position. It is not his fault, he did his level best under very difficult circumstances and I can sympathize with him. Don't shoot at him, gentlemen. He has not deserved it.

The organization from all over, with the exception of America have been clamoring intuitively for work. They knew that in the Keren Hayesod lies salvation. They did not know how and why, but they felt it, and they started work before we had statutes, before the executive could give them the signal.

I had to supplement the executive. It was my good right to do so. When Mr. Simon and De Lieme were appointed I told the Actions Committee they are not the only ones. There will be others—Jabotinsky, this sinister figure, with all his faults and qualities. Most of the people have been criticizing Jabotinsky—have probably never spoken one sentence with him. They have condemned him on his actions. I am not going to defend Jabotinsky. He does not need my defense. He will have an

opportunity to come and speak to you. (Applause.) He came and they told Jabotinsky, "Times are critical. (Naiditch was present at this conversation.) We are breaking down. Bankruptcy is staring us in the face. Come and help." And he said, "I shall help on this and this and this condition." I am the only man that had to work without conditions. Everyone else could formulate to me conditions as though it were my job. Szold formulated conditions. Jabotinsky formulated conditions, and I was between the devil and the deep sea. I could break down or set the machine off and said, "I am going to pay and take the responsibility," and I accepted Jabotinsky's conditions inasmuch as they were compatible with what I could do and with my conscience. This plan of Mr. Szold's was given to them but within the limits of the powers that I could get. What was the center of everything? "Palestine is running to waste. In Palestine money is being wasted. In Palestine we have too much of a staff. Everything is wrong," and I told the gentlemen, "Go ahead, find everything out. You have absolute power to do it," and they cut the budget and they arranged things. They cut it and we have adhered to their decision. But I could not give powers to Szold or to De Lieme or anybody (and I believe that Szold was the right man in spite of the criticism which has been made here), which I myself did not possess. Could I, yes or no, give powers to three people, whoever they may be, to arrange for colonization, for schools, for everything over which the Congress had no clear idea as yet? Mr. Simon himself had no clear idea. I told him, "Do whatever you can, but all the other things we shall have to discuss with the Actions Committee." If I was formerly wrong in not circumscribing the powers which I myself had, I admit that I have been wrong, but I set off the Keren Hayesod and in that I was right. You can have the form, gentlemen, lawyers. But we shall have the substance. This particular publication to which reference was made was a distorted publication of the agreement. The executive did not make the agreement with Jabotinsky, because there was no executive in existence, no executive; only I myself was then in London, and Mr. Sokolow was in Paris. It was my personal charge. It did not collide with the work of Mr. Simon. He did all he wanted to do in Palestine. If Palestine has received them badly, he knew that he would be received badly; it was not their fault; they were sent to Palestine to liquidate. But just as it was wrong, perhaps, to accept the conditions of Jabotinsky, just as it was wrong to accept the conditions of those, just as it was wrong to impose two men on the Actions Committee instead of one, these were wrongs, intrinsic wrongs in the tragic situation of the movement. And thank God, the fetters are broken. Should I go on telling you the story, telling you the story of our proposed journey to America? Odysseus did not travel in a more complicated way. When we heard that things were going on rather badly we offered Nordau; and I called for Nordau imploring him to go to America, went up to him. He was angry, he was disgruntled, it was my job again to go and coax the old man, and then the reply arrived, "Nothing doing. Political conditions did not allow Dr. Nordau's coming to America." So I was strangled all the time, strangled by some invisible power. And now when I came and broke through with my own skin, I did not sit here on a chair. I went about from community to community, day and night, and if I am prepared today to send a telegram or give orders for a telegram to be sent to the high

commissioner that I am ready to deposit a hundred thousand pounds to him for the formation of a land bank, in Palestine, it is my blood which sticks to the hundred thousand. Nine months, all you bankers, financiers, experts, great men in business, you have been laboring about a bank. Here the bank has been created. (Applause and cheers.)

And, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that it is only the beginning. There will be another bank and another bank with wrong statutes with bad safeguards, but it is going to be because it has got to be. (Applause and cheers.)

We have got to do or to die and the Jewish people is indestructible. This will disappear and others will come and that is our conception of the work and the rôle we have to play. It was insinuated and circulated, poison instilled—that is, because we are jealous of each other. I wish to God there should be the others of which I could be jealous. The misfortune, the tragedy of the movement is,—that I have no competition. (Applause.)

Well, that is about all I have to say at this moment. It is perhaps not the speech I would have liked to make, but indeed I got angry. It was torture here during the first three weeks when, with documents and sheets of documents, it was proved to you how Ussischkin or Levin tried to force my hand with a pistol at my head. Of course, I had to think hard because I could accept or refuse. I knew what it meant. I had to weigh up and I had to see everything. I have been oppressed and oppressed from all over the world. And I was slow in deciding and I pray to God that this decision may have been a right one, but I attempted until the last moment to have peace, with my opponents whom I respect, whose presence in the movement is, I know, of enormous value. We cannot bear to lose them and we must not lose them and everything has to be done to accelerate the time when they will come back because back they will come. But still one had to choose, choose between the World Zionist Organization and between the opponents of it. And I repeat it here and I ask them to remember it, and they can hold me to my word at the Congress, I do not agree with a single item in your program. I do not agree with your philosophy of Zionism. I do not agree with your conception of Jewishness. There is no bridge between Washington and Pinsk. Please don't laugh. It is not the fault of Washington and not the fault of Pinsk. But we are trying to build this bridge with our blood. If these people are ready to take the responsibility and go through the same hell through which I am going and my friends are going, my friends the usurpers, the sinister figures of these hunters for power, we will give them all the power, but all the responsibility. Let them take it. I will step down today, tomorrow. You have my word. There are plenty of things I could do better in Zionism than to go running around collecting money. You are using a razor to chop wood. My place is perhaps today in Jerusalem, where a telegram from Jerusalem demands me to be, or in London or in Paris or in Geneva. I have no business to be tomorrow in Youngstown, much as I like Youngstown. But you willed it, you wrote it, I have done it and this land bank is my compensation. That is all. (Cheers and applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a very important message that I want to read, a telegram which has just been addressed to Mr. Rosenblatt.

"Further answering your this morning's telephone inquiry as to whether I will consider accepting Keren Hayesod leadership whilst I differ from the announced policies of the distinguished gentlemen who have unselfishly guided the destinies of the American Organization up to this time I have the most profound respect and admiration for them, but no man or set of men are big enough or powerful enough to obstruct this great humane world movement in the interest of our race and I am sure these gentlemen have the cause too much at heart to harbor any such thought and that they will willingly bow to the will of the majority as expressed in the convention, and will be found, as heretofore, in the front ranks of our enthusiastic supporters. You may say for me, that I will of course gladly serve in any capacity in which I may be drafted.—*Samuel Untermyer.*" (Applause and cheers.)

MR. DE HAAS: The writer of this message says—"Our cause." Since when—

The Convention shouted down further remarks of Mr. de Haas, and there was considerable confusion. On restoring order the Chairman inquired if any of the Committees were ready to report.

MR. LIPSKY again pointed out to the delegates the necessity for remaining over at the Convention until the next day, as the resolutions on the Keren Hayesod were to be submitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next speaker will be that brilliant son of Judah—Dr. Schmarya Levin:

DR. SCHMARYA LEVIN: Those of my colleagues who spoke before me analyzed the attitude taken up by the leaders of the American Zionist Organization, as far as it found expression in the famous memorandum. Each of them chose a certain part of the memorandum and disclosed its aim and purport, namely the metamorphosis of the Zionist organization into a Limited Liability Company. A single paragraph which has not yet been thoroughly ventilated by criticism, remains for me to deal with, and I believe that this very paragraph is the most important in the document. It is the axis upon which revolves the entire *Weltanschauung* of the leaders of American Zionism.

The paragraph would have it that from now on the Zionist Organization shall dedicate all its efforts to the work in Palestine, as opposed to "Diaspora nationalism and *Gegenswartarbeit.*" It is on this phrase as opposed to" that I wish to pause, in order to show you the deadly content of these few words, a content which, were it ever ratified by the Zionists, would uproot the Zionist conception in its entirety, take the soul out of the Zionist movement, and change the Zionist organization into a lifeless machine.

Hitherto we have been acquainted with nationalism as opposed to cosmopolitanism. The authors of the memorandum have invented a new phrase—Diaspora Nationalism. True, there is no mention in the memorandum of nationalism as conceived by the authors. As against Diaspora Nationalism they do not offer us non-Diaspora Nationalism. They only offer us "work in Palestine." But every logical person will ask "where is the contradistinction, the balancing counter-conception?" Is the conception "work in Palestine" the counter-conception to Nationalism? Granted that the authors of the memorandum are not over-exact either in their

logic or in the logical expression of their thoughts, but one need not be a master-logician in order to understand that the counter-conception to a whirlwind is not, for example, a muskmelon.

But if the expression of their thought is helpless and obscure, their aim and intent can, on the other hand, be discerned only too clearly. It is against Jewish nationalism as much that their opposition is directed. Its purpose is to destroy Jewish nationalism throughout the world; to drive it out of the Zionist organization. But they were afraid to give overt expression to their purpose, to bring into the open the stark and naked gospel of assimilationism, so they found a covering fig-leaf in the expression "Diaspora Nationalism," as if there really existed two kinds of nationalism. We are for the time being a nation in exile, a dispersed nation, and if we are to put a ban on Diaspora Nationalism, what kind of Nationalism, I ask, would remain to us? Here is a conception created by "Zionist leaders" which, were the world to accept it, might mean the complete negation of our hope, for it is directed against the very foundation of our national claim. That we are not in the Diaspora a political nationality is self-evident, and it is simply vicious nonsense to reassert this fact as though there were Zionists who denied it. But to deny Diaspora Nationalism is to deny our existence as a nation. It is to say; There is no Jewish nation in exile; the Jewish nation is to come to birth in Palestine. Or, if one is to be logical, one should say. In Palestine will come to birth not *the* Jewish nation, but *a* Jewish nation, a brand new one, for the old one is really no more.

The thoroughgoing absurdity of this conception of the living Jewish nation must be clear to anyone who has mastered the alphabet of nationalism, and we could afford to dismiss the subject with a laugh, and proceed to our agenda, were it not that it represents a *political* danger to our movement.

As long as this particular conception of the Jewish nation, and of its place amongst the other nations, was the conception of Jewish assimilators or of non-Jews, who demanded the disappearance of the Jewish nation, it was opposed by Zionism as a counter-conception. But when this conception is adopted by Zionist leaders, it may well lead to disastrous consequences. Were the statesmen of the various governments who have taken it upon themselves to return Palestine to the Jewish nation to adopt the point of view of the American Zionist leaders, they could claim that the entire agreement was based on a misunderstanding: they have taken it upon themselves to found in Palestine a national home for the Jewish nation; but they have not undertaken to find and restore to the Jews a nationality which they have lost.

Fortunately, however, the nationalist conception is not a discovery of the Zionists and neither the sermons of the reformers on the one hand, nor the vulgarity of the Jewish Radical press with regard to Jewish nationalism on the other hand, and not even the interpretation given this conception by certain Zionist leaders will have any influence on the opinions of the world at large with regard not to the future but to the present position of the Jewish nation amongst the nations of the world.

The theory of nationalism is, like every theory, a child of necessity, and was born, grew and developed there where the need was greatest. Men like Gradowski, Patebnia and Salaviow were its apostles, and from the Slavic countries it passed over into the whole of Europe. England,

for instance, has only recently come to understand its worth. In his work "Nationality and Government" Professor Zimmern was the first to establish the distinction between these two terms, which, in the English language, had unfortunately been regarded hitherto as interchangeable, I say unfortunately, because such confusion of concepts was bound to lead to misunderstanding.

Furthermore, we must remember that Zionism is not in itself a *weltanschauung*, a world-concept. Zionism is only the application of the theory of nationalism to the solution of the Jewish problem. And for this reason we must reject, and not only reject, but actively combat the nationalist concept of the American Zionist leaders as indirectly expressed in the first point of their memorandum. This is the old, well-known concept of the outspoken assimilator, which is responsible for the national decay of certain sections of our people, and under no circumstances will we tolerate its introduction, even in this disguise, amongst our own ranks.

I proceed now to the second point, the question of "*Gegenwartsarbeit*."

The problem of the attitude of the Zionist organization to the question of *Gegenwartsarbeit* is not a new one. It is almost as old as the Zionist organization itself. We need only remember Herzl's call for the conquest of the Kehillas, a call profoundly disturbing to the anti-Zionist world. We need only glance through the protocols of our Congresses to be convinced that those very Zionists who were most active in the work, those Zionists who did not remain in their offices and chat about Zionism when the subject happened to come up, but who went forth and came into daily contact with the facts of Jewish life, the Zionists for whom the Jewish nation was not a vague dream of the Messiah but a living reality, were the ones to urge the necessity of the *Gegenwartsarbeit*. The Zionist organization has at best contained but a part of the Jewish people, and yet it spoke in the name of Jewry as a whole. The moral justification of this policy lay wholly in the fact that Zionism is on the one hand the supreme expression of the national will and has, on the other hand, taken it upon itself to represent *every* Jewish interest. But no sooner does the Zionist organization adopt an attitude of unconcern towards the Diaspora and limit itself entirely to Palestinian matters than it cancels its own right to the name of national representative, and becomes nothing more nor less than an association for Palestinian colonies.

Only Zionists with the imagination and ideas of a *homunculus*, or, to put it bluntly, with dwarfed intelligence, only Zionists whose world concept is soulless and mechanical can dream of separating Palestine from the living Jewish present. But their Zionism is without tradition, without roots, unconnected with our past. It is in consequence strengthless, bloodless and without creative power. It cannot appeal to the Jewish masses, it cannot rouse the Jewish will to fruitfulness, it is destined to sterility.

Only simple or shallow-minded Zionists can believe that it is possible to abandon Jewish destinies in the Diaspora to other organizations and yet influence the Jewish masses in the direction of Zionism. We have an example at hand: the Jewish working classes in America. Every one knows well how difficult it is to win them over to Zionism, and the explanation is obvious. For decades they have been under the influence of anti-nationalist Jewish leaders. This example should be a warning to every thinking Zionist, to every thinking Zionist—but not to the American leaders, who have lost what little hope they had in the Jewish masses, and who, be-

cause they have no points of contact with the Jewish National Home, react in a tendency to change the Zionist Organization into an Organization of Notables, in an ICA without the means of the ICA.

The present conflict is no more than natural and necessary. There have been attempts to throw dust in the eyes of the people, to convince them that the conflict was based on personal issues, was a clash between the European and the American leaders. This is an old game: when men feel that they are too weak to wage successfully a combat of ideas they lend the issue a personal character, for it is easier to attack persons than to defend ideas. But the people must not be deceived: they must understand that the struggle goes much deeper. It is a struggle between followers and leaders over the basic principles of the Zionist concept. And in this struggle is expressed the will of the followers to liberate and restore the Zionism that has been outraged, the Zionism that sprang as a historic unity from the national Jewish reality.

The Zionists of Germany have had to wage the same fight, and it was long before they could overcome their doubts and perplexities and accept the Zionism of Eastern Europe.

I do not believe that Cleveland will see the end of that struggle. The path of an idea is not a path of roses. The path of a great idea is rather a *via dolorosa*. But I do believe that the Cleveland Convention will mark the beginning of a new epoch in American Zionism. In Cleveland American Zionism freed itself of a heavy yoke, and linked itself with the universal Zionism born by historic necessity of the national spirit. I believe that the march of American Zionism, no longer held up by Zionists who are half-Zionists and quarter-Zionists, will make now for a unified programme, a programme in harmony with the single character of the Zionist concept and Zionist aims, and, without determination and energy, take up its share of the work for Palestine and for the Jewish people.

The conflict broke out not between men with different passports, but between Zionists of different, or rather of opposed fundamental conceptions, and the Zionists of America have passed just and magnanimous judgment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am asked to announce that the Board of Directors and Advisory Council of the American Zion Commonwealth will hold a supper meeting in Room C, Mezzanine Floor, at 6:30 P. M. The Resolution Committee will meet 6 P. M. sharp in Room 9064. Please announce that at 7 o'clock tonight a meeting of the Zeire Zion will be held in Hotel Cleveland, Room 8027. Publications Committee will meet in Room 9-B-L, Hotel Cleveland.

Less than ten years ago I was not a Zionist. I was not a non-Zionist. I was an anti-Zionist. On the public platform, wherever I could get a hearing in the newspapers, where I could get space, I fought this movement. Gradually conviction came to me that my place was here, and this evening I have the proud distinction of being your presiding officer. You have not asked anything about my past, you have not asked the age of my Zionism. Whether you have knowledge of my record as a Zionist or not, or whether you are taking me on the word of others, you have not gone into my antecedents. This remark is made by way of a preface to what I am going to say. This afternoon, a short half hour ago, perhaps, there was read to you a telegram from a man who was not always a Zionist, but I say to you as a lawyer of 30 years' practice and with an intimate knowledge of the

leaders of the American Bar and of their standing as lawyers and as business men advisors, that Samuel Untermyer is the acknowledged head of the business men's lawyers of America, and that I consider his willingness to serve and to lend his name as a practical endorsement of the Keren Hayesod, as a most valuable acquisition; verily the hand of the God of Israel is at the steering wheel. And yet, and yet, the man, who four months ago, as an officer of the late administration, came to my state to organize the Texas Palestine Refrigerating Company, a man who went to the Non-Zionist wealth of the state, a man who knew and concurred in my program to get our directors from the wealthy non-Jews who were not Zionists, so that the public could understand that the matter was being endorsed not as Zionism but as a business matter, that man a half hour ago had the temerity to come into this hall immediately after the reading of the telegram from Mr. Untermyer and to make a sneering inquiry because Mr. Untermyer used the expression "our cause," to make the sneering inquiry "since when our cause." Ladies and gentlemen, there are times, and perhaps for a presiding honorary chairman there is time only for moderation of utterance, but I say I wish I were right now on a Texas prairie near one of those trees and could hang my hat on that tree and cuss for half an hour. Jacob de Haas, thy wreath has lost a rose.

RABBI GLAZER: We have heard this afternoon the addresses of the President of the World Organization, of Ussischkin, of Mossinsohn, of Levin and of Naiditch, and in their behalf, as well as in behalf of the new-born child in our movement, the Presiding Officer of this Convention, I would like to place a proposition before the Convention. During the address of the President I saw tears in the eyes of many. We felt with him in his sadness. The message which he has spoken will be read to Jewry in every corner of the world. I say now, before you return to carry his message to your brothers, gentlemen, before you leave the hall, every one of you should pledge for his district and community a sum to be raised for the Keren Hayesod. You have heard our President state that he cannot reach every community in this land. He can reach only the largest. It is for you to reach the smaller for him.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will take this matter up tomorrow.

DELEGATE: I move that every delegate shall make an honest pledge for his district, and let our worthy President know what the pledges will be and let every delegate know his duty towards the cause.

DELEGATE: Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor will signify by saying Aye: those against will say No.

Motion carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Resolutions for the Keren Hayesod is ready to report. This is the heart of the whole thing.

MR. SCHWEITZER: Mr. Chairman and fellow Zionists, we have worked out the resolutions on the Keren Hayesod. As this is the most important business before the convention, I hope that you will remain until the end, until every resolution will be discussed and adopted. In working on the resolutions of the Keren Hayesod, we have taken as the fundamental ground the resolution that has been passed unanimously by the London

Conference in July, 1920. With regard to the directors of the Keren Hayesod as it has been established in London under the worthy executive, we have never had any doubt as to their integrity, their honesty and well meaning and the charter that has been made by them, the charter that was legalized on March 27th was a temporary charter, for the following reasons: the matter of the Keren Hayesod has been dragged from July until the end of March practically. There were all kinds of obstructions from the men that were supposed to help to legalize the Keren Hayesod, mainly from the men that had 51 per cent control of the Keren Hayesod as members of the executive. You know, I am speaking now of Julius Simon. On the other hand, our organization here, by adopting certain measures, by adopting certain resolutions and recommendations at the Buffalo Convention in November, 1920, have hindered the organization of the Keren Hayesod. However, Europe did not wait for the charter. The Eastern European Jews had all the trust and confidence in our executive, in our World Executive. They began to work as early as October, 1920, and contributions were coming in increasingly from all over Europe and outside of Europe. The present need for a charter was also due to the fact that no contributions could be made by Eastern Europe without having a certificate for each contribution. How, then, could one expect to go on with the work with Palestine, waiting for our funds to come through to bring in the increasing number of Chaluzim, to help them to settle on the land, to help them to get their homes, without the funds coming in for the Keren Hayesod? All these various matters induced the directors of the Keren Hayesod to come to the creation, to legalize the Keren Hayesod temporarily until the next congress. Every protection was made for the interest of each contributor, for the interest of our certificate holders, that is, votes on the selection of the directors in the Keren Hayesod should be guaranteed. The fact that it was so is very plainly seen from a document that has been brought by our distinguished delegation, together with the charter of the Keren Hayesod of which so much has been spoken, which has been slandered by the opposing group of the Keren Hayesod. This memorandum clearly states that the charter is a temporary one, until the Congress will decide what actual final form the charter is to take, until every Zionist Federation will have a chance to bring in its recommendations, until the various bodies which will constitute the Keren Hayesod will have a chance to work out their relationships to the Keren Hayesod. As I said, the basis for our resolution was the actual, the original resolution that was adopted in London in July, 1920, at the annual convention. We have also incorporated all the recommendations which have been enumerated in the memorandums accompanying the actual charter, the provisional charter. I hope you will listen attentively to what the secretary of our committee will read to you, first all the resolutions up to the end, and then every resolution considered singly. Thank you.

At this point the Chair was left by Judge Dannenbaum and taken by Mr. Rothenberg.

It was pointed out that the majority of the delegates had consented to stay over at the convention until the next day. It was therefore decided that the Resolutions on the Keren Hayesod be left over until the next day. *The Session then adjourned at 6:00 P. M., to reconvene the next morning at 9:00 A. M.*

SEVENTH SESSION

HELD AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUILDING, ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8TH

The Convention was called to order at 10:30 A. M. by the Chairman, Judge Henry J. Dannenbaum.

MR. BARONDESS called attention to the fact that the first business of the Convention was the consideration of resolutions concerning the Keren Hayesod.

It was, however, decided, in view of the absence of Mr. Neumann, to proceed with other business. The floor was taken by Mr. Lipsky, who addressed the Convention on the subject of elections to the Congress.

MR. LIPSKY: The committee in charge of the Zionist Congress election has worked out a plan. I don't know whether my interpretation of the plan conforms exactly to the text of the resolution that is to be introduced by the Committee, but the Convention knows that, according to the rules of the Congress, the vote must be by secret individual ballot. Hitherto, in the United States, the delegates to Congress have been practically elected by a convention, or appointed by the National Executive Committee. I understand that our Administration received the statutes and rules with regard to the elections for the Congress, and those rules indicate that it is the intention of the Inner Actions Committee to enforce the constitutional provision with regard to the direct election of delegates to the Congress. Now, that presents a difficulty. It presents a difficulty if we were to elect delegates at this Convention, and it would present a more serious difficulty if the attempt to elect the delegates were handed over to the National Executive Committee.

I therefore submit a plan for the election of delegates by the Zionists affiliated with the Zionist Organization of America, and I want to take the liberty of presenting the ideas with the understanding that the actual text of the resolution will be introduced by Mr. Topkis, the Chairman of the Committee.

My proposal is this, keeping within the regulations of the World Zionist Organization, that we at this Convention nominate candidates to be delegates to the Congress. We assume that we are entitled to have a certain number of delegates, say thirty or forty, fifty or sixty; we estimate that we are going to nominate probably sixty. We shall allow the Convention to nominate as many as it is in a position to nominate, of persons who are qualified to be delegates and who will accept a mandate.

In addition to that, the right to nominate shall also be granted to the Hadassah, and their nominations shall be placed on the ballot. The right to nominate shall also be given to the Order Sons of Zion. The right to nominate shall also be given to any group of shekel payers, and the right to nominate shall also be given to any district that has nominations to make. This Convention makes its nominations. Hadassah makes nomi-

nations in accordance with the number of shekel payers it has. The Order Sons of Zion makes nominations in the same way. The District does it. Anyone who had any serious nominations to make shall make them and then a ballot is set up.

The nominations are all printed on a ballot. They are arranged in alphabetical order. Hadassah nominations are placed under the Hadassah rubric. The Order Sons of Zion nomination are put under the rubric of the Order Sons of Zion. The Hadassah members will vote for the candidates under the Hadassah rubric. The members of the Order Sons of Zion shall vote for candidates under the Order Sons of Zion rubric, and so on. All of these are put in alphabetical order, giving the names and addresses and occupations and also, if it can be done, the position the candidates take on certain fundamental questions. Then these ballots are distributed to the Districts for their shekel payers. They may be distributed to the Hadassah for their members, to the various camps of the Order Sons of Zion to be voted on by their members, and then to each of the districts. The districts come together and hold meetings of their members, and there each member present votes by direct ballot, and all the ballots are placed in an envelope and forwarded to the National Office. The Hadassah Chapters meet and vote in the same way. The members of the Order Sons of Zion meet in their camps and do the same thing. Then there are quite a large number of shekel payers who are not in districts to whom a ballot would have to be sent by the office and they would vote by mail. Anybody wanting to vote by mail in any city, would have the right to mail his ballot to the District Committee.

Now, every shekel payer would have the right to vote for only one delegate. You may have sixty, seventy or eighty candidates who obtain votes, from one vote to a thousand votes, and delegates will be selected up to the number to which we are entitled. First the one with most votes, the next, and so on, and in that way if the one receiving the highest number of votes does not wish to go to the Congress, then the one next on the list will be promoted. In that way we conform with the rules. In that way be carry through a direct election and the expression of the shekel payers is indicated unmistakably with regard to the elections. This is about the only way in which we can successfully carry through an actual election and have it finished by about July 14th, because the persons who are elected must know before the middle of July whether they are elected, in order to make the necessary preparations to go to the Congress.

At the London Zionist Conference power was given to the London Executive to determine the number of shekel payers entitled to elect one delegate, and this was fixed at 2,000. That was done because we in London provided that the next Congress should not consist of any more than four hundred delegates, and they had to provide themselves with a key number to provide for the elections. In the meantime shekel payers are coming in from week to week, and we don't know where they are located. We cannot take Pittsburgh or Baltimore or New York alone. We have to provide every shekel payer with a ballot. If it is agreeable to the Convention we will do as follows: we will say that a certain date, say June 19th, shall be the last day on which nominations can be made by districts. There shall be a last date set on which election returns can be made by districts. Then we can establish as a matter of law who has been elected by about July 15th, and all the candidates elected would

know in ample time whether they are entitled to go to the Congress as delegates.

Now, in addition I propose, and I think the Committee will approve also, that from June 19th until June 26th there shall be a shekel week throughout the United States in order to permit all Zionists, all shekel payers, to vote for delegates to the Congress.

A long discussion ensued as to the method of electing the delegates to the Convention. Judge Rosenblatt raised the objection that under the system proposed by Mr. Lipsky, it would be possible, in view of the fact that a few popular men would carry away most of the votes, that a large number of men with very few votes would of necessity have to be delegates in order to make up the quota of delegates to which the United States was entitled. He therefore suggested that each shekel payer be entitled to vote for three delegates.

Mr. Avner raised the question of how duplication of votes by shekel payers would be avoided. Mr. Lipsky replied that there was no way of avoiding this, beyond reliance upon the honesty of the voters.

After considerable discussion Mr. TOPKIS, Chairman of the Committee on Congress, submitted the plan which the Committee had worked out in the form of a resolution.

MR. TOPKIS: "The method of election of delegates to attend the World Zionist Congress to be held at Carlsbad in September this year to represent the shekel payers affiliated with the Zionist Organization of America.

First. The Convention shall nominate twice as many delegates as the Zionist of America are entitled to elect, making provision however, for nominations to be made by the Zionist Districts or groups of Districts.

Second. All nominations made either by Districts or by the Convention are to be placed in alphabetical order on the official ballot, giving the name, address, occupation and source of nomination of each delegate.

Third. The National Executive Committee shall elect the Central Election Committee to be in full charge of the election, subject to the control of the National Executive Committee.

Fourth. The Central Elections Committee shall send numbered official ballots to all Districts and to such shekel payers as are not affiliated with any District.

Fifth. The District Executive Committees shall give notice to their members and to the shekel payers affiliated with them of a special meeting to be held for the purpose of voting for a delegate to attend the World Zionist Congress.

Sixth. Shekel payers affiliated with Districts shall vote either in person or by mail.

Seventh. Shekel payers not affiliated with Districts shall forward their ballots to the Central Elections Committee.

Eighth. Each shekel payer shall vote for only one nominee.

Ninth. Ballots shall be forwarded by the District Committees to the Central Elections Committee.

Tenth. The Central Elections Committee shall count all the ballots received either from Districts or from unorganized shekel payers and the nominees receiving the highest number of votes in order of their election

shall be declared elected and so certified by the Central Elections Committee to the National Executive Committee.

Eleventh. In case any delegate elected shall resign and shall express his intention not to attend the Congress, the Central Elections Committee shall automatically promote the candidate receiving the next highest number of votes to take his place.

Twelfth. This Convention fixes June 21st as the last date for the filing of nominations by Districts.

Thirteenth. The last date for the receipt of ballots from individual shekel payers or from District Committees shall be July 4th.

Fourteenth. In view of the importance of the forthcoming Zionist Congress and in order that the largest possible number of Zionists and Jews shall participate in the election of delegates to this important session of the Congress, this Convention fixes the dates between June 19th and June 26th as shekel week and calls upon all Zionist Districts to organize for the purpose of enrolling shekel payers."

I move the adoption of that report.

Further discussion then ensued on this subject.

MR. LIPSKY pointed out the necessity of permitting the Hadassah and the Order Sons of Zion, as well the Districts, to make their own nominations.

MR. SHULMAN questioned the validity of the plan proposed, as it might result in a delegate obtaining two thousand votes and yet not being elected to the Congress through other delegates having obtained a superior number of votes.

MR. BARONDESS: I think, Mr. Chairman, we are getting into a muddle of democracy.

Why cannot we proceed along a plan which will be simple? We have an idea how many delegates the Order Sons of Zion is entitled to. We have an idea also how many delegates they would want to have, and how many will attend the Convention. In regard to the Hadassah, that is a different matter to determine, and it seems to me that the safest way is to allot to this organization a number of delegates which they themselves should nominate. Then we make our nominations at this Convention subject to the elections by the District. That is the safest way, without adopting an elaborate plan which will be most difficult in carrying out. For that reason I suggest that we should, here and now, allot a number of delegates to the Order Sons of Zion, and I don't see why the Order Sons of Zion should not be allowed to nominate them. Let them nominate them and let the Hadassah delegates also be nominated by the Hadassah, and let us make our nominations upon the old plan of electing a delegate and an alternate. The man who will receive the lower number of votes will be the alternate, and in the event of a delegate not going the alternate will be chosen, as will happen in many cases, and the alternate will go.

After further discussion an amendment was offered by Mr. Shelvin that the entire matter be referred to the incoming Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization of America, with instructions to work out a plan in consonance with the constitution of the Zionist Organization.

The amendment was seconded and carried.

The objection was then raised by a delegate that with the adoption of Mr. Shelvin's amendment it would be impossible for the Convention to nominate any delegates.

The Chairman then submitted the report of the Committee to the vote of the Convention. The report of the Committee was adopted by the Convention.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Keren Hayesod.

MR. NEUMANN: There are a series of eight resolutions. These are intended to cover all the important points which have been raised in connection with the Keren Hayesod question. I shall read them through to the end and go back and submit them for your consideration, clause by clause!

"I. We pledge our whole hearted support to the Keren Hayesod as established by the World Zionist Executive Committee, pursuant to the resolutions adopted by the London Zionist Conference.

"II. We regard the Keren Hayesod as the central fund of the Zionist Organization, under the control of the Zionist Congress, acting through the World Zionist Executive Committee—collected upon the principle of Maaser—for the purpose of securing the support and co-operation of all Jews in laying the foundation of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, and which all federations and 'separate unions' are under obligation to support; it being understood that the controlling interest of the Keren Hayesod shall be vested exclusively in the Zionist Congress and its legally constituted authorities and instrumentalities.

"III. We direct the National Executive Committee to accept the invitation extended to our organization to co-operate with the Keren Hayesod Bureau for the United States of America, established by the representatives of the World Zionist Organization, and of the Keren Hayesod, Ltd., and to provide for proper representation on such boards or committees as have been or may hereafter be constituted to direct the activities of the Keren Hayesod in this country.

"IV. We hereby call upon all Zionist districts and all Zionists, to proceed at once with the work for the Keren Hayesod, in order that *without delay* the foundation of the Jewish National Home in Palestine may be laid in accordance with the policies of the World Zionist Organization."

I think that this following resolution, which is based upon that memorandum which was sent to us by the London Office as their recommendations for the permanent organization of the Keren Hayesod, and to which I referred in my address the other night, was ignored by those who criticized the charter of the Keren Hayesod, as this contains recommendations and those provisions for the safeguard that have been asked for.

"V. The Twenty-fourth Annual Zionist Convention resolves that the Keren Hayesod, while remaining under the control of the World Zionist Organization, shall be so constituted that it shall function here in America as a democratic agency, and that, with that end in view, provisions shall be made for the participation in the management of the Keren Hayesod Bureau, by all Jewish groups, parties, and organizations desirous of co-operating in the work."

This resolution is in the nature of a compromise resolution in the committee relative to the fund for donations and investments. It was claimed that the appeals should not be for investments, but for free offerings, and that the American Keren Hayesod should accept money only on the understanding that it shall be a donation or free offering. The Committee could not agree to that, but finally did agree to this compromise proposal by which all those who could be asked to reassign their property interest in the Keren Hayesod to the World Zionist Organization to be used for this purpose, while making it perfectly free to those who desire to secure whatever financial return may be derived from the Keren Hayesod contribution or investment to do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: I note the word "permanent" with reference to the use of two-thirds of the funds in the enterprise. It seems to me this is a rather rigid phrase, requiring that the money be permanent or lasting. There may be some temporary expenditures necessary.

MR. NEUMANN: I quote the wording of the London Resolution. It does say that not more than one-third shall be spent in current expenditures.

"VI.

"WHEREAS, The resolutions adopted at the London Conference specifically provide that 'at least 20 per cent of the funds collected by the Keren Hayesod shall be given to the Jewish National Fund,' and 'of the further funds collected not more than one-third shall be spent in current expenditure for education, social welfare, immigration, and similar purposes, in Palestine, for the building up of the Jewish National Home, while at least two-thirds are to be invested in permanent national institutions or economic undertakings,' and 'that the holders of certificates will participate in the administration of the fund and in the revenue of the economic undertakings established by the fund' and

"WHEREAS, the Jews of America may, and should, in view of their relative economic position, be expected to forego any gains or emoluments that may be derived from the economic undertakings of the Keren Hayesod.

"We call upon and urge all Jews contributing to the Keren Hayesod to designate their contributions as free offerings, assigning to the World Zionist Organization, any and all of their property rights in the Keren Hayesod, reserving to themselves all other rights as members.

"And we direct the incoming Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization of America, to take the necessary steps to carry out the purpose of this resolution."

"VII.

"The Committee on Keren Hayesod, having given careful consideration to the Memorandum on the Legal Status of the Keren Hayesod submitted by the head office of the Keren Hayesod at London, for the consideration of our Organization, with a view to reaching an understanding regarding the permanent form of organization of the Keren Hayesod at the forthcoming Zionist Congress.

"Recommend that the Convention approve the following suggestions contained in that Memorandum, and instruct our delegates to the forth-

coming Zionist Congress to endeavor to bring about the permanent organization of the Keren Hayesod, on the basis of these recommendations:

"1. Contributors to the Keren Hayesod are to be organized by countries.

"2. In each country or group of countries, an annual gathering of contributors or Certificate Holders, or of their representatives, shall take place, these gatherings shall in turn, elect representatives to the Council of the Keren Hayesod. For these elections, each Certificate Holder shall have *one vote and no more*, the number of representatives to the Council to be fixed in accordance with the aggregate of the country's contributions to the Keren Hayesod.

"3. The Council shall meet at least once a year, and unless otherwise decided by the Directors, it shall meet at the place where the Head Office of the Keren Hayesod is situated.

"4. The annual meeting of the Council shall be entitled

- a. To consider and pass the balance sheet of the corporation.
- b. To consider and pass proposals of the Directors, regarding any payments of dividend to Certificate Holders.
- c. To conduct elections for the appointment of
 1. Half the Board of Directors.
 2. The whole Board of Trustees.

"5. One-half of the Board of Directors, including the managing director, shall be appointed by the Executive of the Zionist Organization, who shall have the right, any time, to withdraw any director they have appointed and replace him by another. In this way the Keren Hayesod is to maintain the character of an all-Jewish institution, and at the same time, ensure the connection with the Zionist Organization, and preserve the influence of the latter over the Keren Hayesod.

"6. In accordance with the above, the charter of the Keren Hayesod shall be so amended that the rights of the contributors or certificate holders and members of the Keren Hayesod shall be specifically guaranteed by the charter and statutes thereof.

"VIII.

"The Convention declares that, in the interest of the cause, it is essential that the controversy over the Keren Hayesod in this country, publicly engaged in by opposing groups within the Zionist Organization of America, shall forthwith come to an end. The resolutions on the Keren Hayesod, adopted at this convention, call for the immediate, complete, and unstinted co-operation on the part of all Zionists, regardless of their views as individuals, so that the constructive work in Palestine may suffer no further delay, and we affirm our deep conviction that the example set by the members of the Zionist Organization of America, in giving their whole-hearted support to the Keren Hayesod, will be followed by the Jews of America at large, and that through the Keren Hayesod, the Jews of this country, will make their maximum contribution for the upbuilding of Erez Israel." (End of resolution of Keren Hayesod Committee.)

I am told that there is a minority report. I wish to state that, as you know, the chair has appointed five members of the minority on the Committee of Fifteen of the Keren Hayesod. The members of the minority have not participated in the work of the Committee, but one member of the minority came in and reported that they had a minority report. They had a minority report before they knew what the majority report was going to be like. Generally the minority works together with the majority, and when they fail to reach an agreement they then present a minority report. In this case, they, without collaborating with us, announced in advance that they would have a minority report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Nevertheless, they are entitled to present the minority report.

DELEGATE: I withdraw the minority report.

MR. NEUMANN: I offer a motion, if it is in place, to adopt the first paragraph of this record, the first resolution:

"We pledge our whole-hearted support to the Keren Hayesod as established by the World Zionist Executive Committee, pursuant to the resolutions adopted by the London Zionist Conference."

I move its adoption.

DELEGATE: Second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: That does not prevent the minority from presenting their report.

MR. AVNER: In order to facilitate the procedure, in order not to complicate what we are doing, and in order to meet the issue fairly and squarely and as quickly as possible, I should like, on behalf of the minority group, to make this suggestion: while there are nine or ten parts in the majority report, it is not the intention of the minority group to argue or to discuss the various parts of this report. It is our desire simply and plainly and clearly to go on the record by one single short resolution as to our position on the entire controversy. Beyond that, beyond going on record, we have no desire to hinder the Convention proceedings, to delay it or to engage in any discussion, and what I have in mind is this, that if the majority group will so frame the issue, so that we can take a quick vote on it, after we have recorded our position in the matter, the balance of the discussion and the other part can proceed section by section, *seriatim* or in group, so that we can get through it quickly. As far as we are concerned, all we ask is for one chance to go down on the record as a matter of principle. Therefore I would appeal to the majority to give us the one opportunity of presenting a minority report as an amendment to the majority. Then, when it is voted down, we are free to proceed with the majority report.

MR. BLUM: The minority report of the Committee on Keren Hayesod is as follows:

"WHEREAS, the Keren Hayesod, Limited, the corporation now soliciting funds in the United States, is undemocratic in character, violates all Zionist precedent, usurps the power of the World Organization, and is contrary to the resolutions adopted at the Conference, therefore be it

"Resolved, that this Convention of the Zionist Organization of America assumes no responsibility for the Keren Hayesod as now established."

The Chairman has stated we must move with dispatch. The intima-

tion by the Chairman of the Committee on Keren Hayesod that the minority might have taken part in the deliberation would have involved a great deal of time. Our report is very brief and omits all details, because it is founded on principle, taking the position which is set forth in this resolution; any discussion of detail would be impossible as well as useless.

In order to bring the matter to a head, Mr. Neumann has consented to withdraw the motion he made for the adoption of the first part of his majority report, and that motion being withdrawn, I move you, Mr. Chairman, that this Convention adopt as a statement of its position with reference to the Keren Hayesod the minority report, the resolution which I have just presented.

MR. AVNER: I second the motion.

It was proposed and seconded that the minority report be laid on the table.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

MR. AVNER: I leave the issue in the hands of Judge Dannenbaum.

MR. ROSENBLATT: It seems to me that the minority are too anxious now to have the entire debate cut off. Their position is entirely untenable, but it seems to me that we have no moral right to cut off the whole thing by a motion to lay on the table. I believe the minority should state their case.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion that the minority report be laid on the table will please raise their right hands.

A vote was taken; 93 were in favor and 21 against.

THE CHAIRMAN stated it as his opinion that there was some confusion in the minds of the delegates, and that delegates were not quite clear as to the nature of the motion which had by resolution been tabled.

MR. AVNER pointed out that voting to lay the minority report on the table was not a vote against the issue.

MR. BLUM then re-read the minority resolution.

MR. LIPSKY: It seems to me from conversations with delegates that the explanation for the apparent state of confusion is that delegates have felt the minority resolution to be so outrageous in character that they do not want to lay it on the table. They want to vote it down. I therefore ask the mover to withdraw his motion.

The motion to table the minority resolution was thereupon withdrawn, and the Chairman laid before the Convention the minority resolution for a direct vote.

It was moved, seconded and carried that this vote be taken by roll-call.

A roll-call was taken, the delegates voting as their names were called. The vote was 25 in favor of the minority report, 140 against.

MR. NATHANSON submitted a resolution to the effect that the Convention condemns the action of the minority as outrageous, disgraceful and unworthy of any self-respecting Zionist. Dr. Hilkowich seconded the motion.

The Chair ruled that the motion was a duplication of the resolution already defeated, and was therefore out of order.

MR. NEUMANN then resubmitted as a resolution the first paragraph of the report of the Committee on the Keren Hayesod, reading as follows:

"We pledge our whole-hearted support to the Keren Hayesod as established by the World Zionist Executive Committee, pursuant to the resolutions adopted by the London Zionist Conference."

The motion was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN then called upon Mr. Naiditch to address the Convention.

Speaking in Yiddish, Mr. Naiditch expressed satisfaction with the resolutions adopted. He believed that American Jewry will in the future take the leading rôle in the work of the Keren Hayesod. With European Jewry broken up the rebuilding of Palestine was mainly the task of the Jews of America. In conclusion he cited a number of examples of sacrifices East European Jewry has made for the Keren Hayesod. In the Ukraine Jewish women would offer all their jewelry to the Keren Hayesod.

THE CHAIRMAN: I need not introduce Dr. Weizmann.

DR. WEIZMANN: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Zionists, I do not propose to detain you many minutes. The resolution which you have just adopted is a momentous one, and will mark a new era in American Zionism, and I am sure in the Zionism of the World. It is a compensation for the London Conference. You will come to the Congress and you will, in deliberation with other Zionists, work out all the methods, all the safeguards, all the necessary economical legal forms of the Keren Hayesod, but the success of the Keren Hayesod depends on two things: Firstly, on the complete comprehension of Zionism, on appreciation of the solemn moment through which we are passing, and of the great duty which weighs upon us; and secondly, on the performance in Palestine. The first constructive work in Palestine will be further encouragement for the Keren Hayesod. I announced yesterday, the first step out of the first money collected in this country will be the creation of a land bank, which is the paramount instrument for the upbuilding of the country. Good performance in Palestine, a properly constructed Keren Hayesod here, faith in yourself and to your powers—that will build Palestine. American Jewry itself can build up Palestine. If you will it, it will be done. And the will, your will, has been manifested to-day. Don't be discouraged. Don't be intimidated. Don't be frightened. Right, faith, confidence is on your side. We have had such times and we have had such crises. We have gone through them. The faithful ones will come to us. Those who won't come, let them stay away in peace. For us the fight is at an end. Work, hard work, that begins now, and when you return to your constituents, you will tell them the message. There was a severe crisis. It has passed, and if any wounds or scars are left, they will be healed by hard work and faith in the future of Zionism. That is all I have to say to you at this moment.

I am glad to take this opportunity of making a correction in my speech of yesterday. I said that I heard here that the Balfour declaration was framed here, was made here, and I said it is not true. In that form it is not true. The Balfour declaration was framed in London, as I said. A change in the second part of the Balfour declaration, as I find out now, was introduced here in the change in one phrase in the second part. It is considered an important change, and in the interest of truth I will read a telegram of Judge Mack:

"June 8, A.M. 9:51.

"DR. WEIZMANN:

"Zionist Convention, Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, O., October tenth, nineteen seventeen, you cabled Brandeis amended formula then under discussion ending after word enjoyed "in any other country by such Jews who are fully contented with their existing nationality and citizenship." de Haas proposed change to present ending on ground that suggested formula places Zionism on a principle of discontent, which is most undesirable. Suggested change approved by Wise and Levin was cabled England, October seventeenth. Levin at least knew where this vital change originated and measures were taken to make it effective. I trust you will state facts fully to Convention, preferably in Levin's presence, correcting your original statement with explanation great importance of change suggested by Americans and adopted in final form.

"JULIAN W. MACK."

I am glad to make this statement. I am glad to repeat that in this way and in other ways, Americans have always been willing to help and co-operate in the political work, and I hope they will help and co-operate in the work of the Keren Hayesod.

I have also one other statement to make. I would like to say that at the first meeting, the first evening, Mr. Tulin, who has been mentioned so often, has been rather treated harshly. Mr. Tulin throughout these difficult times has genuinely, honestly tried to bring about peace. It was a difficult and disagreeable part to be the intermediary, who generally gets the blows from both sides. It would be unjust that the assembly should remain under the impression that Mr. Tulin rendered anything else but a genuine and truthful service towards the interest of peace. He did it to the best of his ability, and I think he tried his best.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, this is my last word to you. It was a great privilege and a great experience to be among you, to work with you, to hear you, to be helped by you, and to help you. I hope that with many of you we shall meet again in Carlsbad, and if we won't meet physically, we shall meet in spirit, we shall meet in the work, and we shall meet soon, in the advance trend of our movement, in Palestine, where we all expect to be soon. Thank you.

Dr. Weizmann was given a great ovation by the delegation, who applauded him and cheered for about five minutes, ending by singing the Hatikvah.

THE CHAIRMAN: As Chairman of this Convention, it would be my proper function to express to Dr. Weizmann and his colleagues words of farewell. I cannot trust myself to do so, but I shall assume the authority to appoint a committee consisting of Mr. Lipsky, Mr. A. Goldberg, Judge Rosenblatt, Mr. Rothenberg and Mr. Emanuel Neumann to escort Dr. Weizmann from here to the hotel as expressing the feelings of this Convention and the appreciation of the valiant services rendered by the five in the successful conduct of the campaign.

A motion for adjournment until 1:30 P. M. of the same day was moved, seconded and carried.

Whereupon the Convention adjourned, to reconvene at 1:30 P. M.

EIGHTH SESSION

HELD AT THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BUILDING, JUNE 8, 1921

The convention was called to order at 2 P. M. by the Chairman, Mr. Morris Rothenberg.

The Chairman appealed to the Convention for quick and orderly action, as most of the delegates would have to leave Cleveland on the evening of the same day. He called upon Mr. Jacob Fishman, Chairman of the Committee on General Resolutions, to present the resolutions decided on by the Committee to the Convention.

MR. FISHMAN: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: the General Resolutions Committee consists of the following delegates, two names having been added to the list:

M. Friedman, Pawtucket; L. Kneeter, Omaha, Neb.; Sol Hurwitz, Cleveland; Rabbi L. Feinberg, Cincinnati; H. W. Freeman, Houston, Texas; Garfield A. Berlinsky, Baltimore; Miss Lotta Levenson; S. J. Nathanson, New Haven.

The Committee begs to submit the following resolution:

"LOYALTY TO WORLD ZIONIST ORGANIZATION

"Reaffirming our loyalty and allegiance to the World Zionist Organization and acknowledging the supreme authority of the Zionist Congress in all Zionist affairs and of such other legislative bodies established in accordance with the statutes of the Zionist Congress, we here in Convention assembled, in order to make a public record of our unalterable desire to maintain the unity of the World Zionist Organization, declare that we hold the decisions of the Zionist Congress as binding upon us and that we are under moral and legal obligations to support all institutions for the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home established and maintained by and under the authority of the Zionist Congress."

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. FISHMAN: Resolution No. 2.

The Convention taking note of criticisms levelled against Menachim Ussischkin, Chairman of the Zionist Commission in Palestine, on the floor of this Convention, and of propaganda carried on in advance of this Convention, expresses its unqualified confidence in his integrity of purpose and devotion to the cause of the Jewish people in the upbuilding of the Jewish National Home.

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried by a unanimous vote. Mr. Berlinsky did not vote.

MR. FISHMAN: Resolution No. 3.

Resolved, That this Convention of delegates, representing the Zionist Organization of America, deeply regrets that fundamental differences of

opinion have culminated in the resignations of our respected leaders, Hon. Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Judge Julian W. Mack, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Dr. Friedenwald, Nathan Straus and their associates, and here now adopts, and orders inserted in the minutes, its expression of profound appreciation of the inestimable services rendered by them to the cause of Zionism in a critical moment of its history.

The resolution was seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. FISHMAN: Resolution No. 3.

This Convention extends its profoundest thanks to the distinguished guests, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, Prof. Albert Einstein, Menachem Ussischkin, Schmarya Levin, Dr. Benzion Mossinsohn and I. A. Naiditch, for their visit to the United States. Their presence here has served to stimulate the Zionist sentiment among the rank and file of our people and has filled our hearts with new inspiration to work for the upbuilding of the Jewish Homeland in Palestine.

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. FISHMAN: Three resolutions bearing upon the National Fund.

(5) The Convention recognizes the Jewish National Fund as the organ for carrying out the Jewish land policy in Palestine along the lines laid down at the Annual Zionist Conference held in London in July, 1920.

(6) The Convention instructs the incoming National Executive Committee to encourage and further energetically the activities in this country in behalf of the Jewish National Fund, in conjunction with the Jewish National Fund Bureau for America and alongside the work for the Keren Hayesod.

(7) The Convention approves the proposition of the Jewish National Fund Bureau for America to raise during the ensuing year, by way of Land Donations for the Jewish National Fund, six hundred thousand dollars toward the cost of the land recently purchased in the Valley of Yizre'el, and calls upon the Zionists of the country to give the project their unstinted support.

Resolutions 6 and 7 were moved, seconded and carried by unanimous vote, each resolution being taken singly.

After Resolution No. 8 had been submitted, Mr. Neumann obtained the floor.

MR. NEUMANN: I am heartily in favor of the purpose of the resolution. I only question the propriety of the present form of the resolution. The National Fund has an agreement with the Keren Hayesod by which the National Fund is entitled to 25 per cent of all the Keren Hayesod collections. I think that put in that bald way, it may be subject to misinterpretation. It ought to be stated that the National Fund has that understanding with the Keren Hayesod, otherwise you will have the impression that there are going to be two great drives which may be unrelated and unconnected. I think it would be wise to refer that to the incoming Executive to work out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that amendment seconded?

DELEGATE: Seconded.

THE CHAIRMAN: The resolution as read has been amended to the following effect, that it be referred to the incoming Executive Committee. All those in favor of the amendment will say Aye; all those against say No. Motion carried unanimously.

MR. FISHMAN: Resolution No. 8.

(8) This Convention directs the National Executive Committee to take steps to establish a basis for securing the co-operation of the Order Sons of Zion in all of its activities and to allot to the Order Sons of Zion a place or places on its membership for representatives of the Order Sons of Zion to be selected by it.

The Order Sons of Zion as a body is not represented now on the National Executive Committee. It is only represented inasmuch as the members of the Sons of Zion in the various districts have representation. It has been thought that the Order as a body ought to have some representation on the National Executive Committee. This resolution seeks to provide a method for such representation.

The Resolution was moved, seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. AVNER: In all matters of policy which are now being acted upon, which are in the nature of instructions to the incoming Executive, the minority group abstains from voting in order not to tie the hands of the incoming Executive.

MR. NEUMAN: May I ask through the Chair that Mr. Avner be kind enough to explain how participation in the vote on the part of the minority of the Convention could tie the hands of or interfere or embarrass the incoming Executive Committee?

MR. AVNER: We do not want to be put in a position where it will afterwards be thrown in our faces that these resolutions were passed unanimously.

CHAIRMAN: The remarks of Mr. Avner are taken down, but it is my duty to state that unless there is a vote to the contrary on any proposition, it is passed unanimously.

MR. FISHMAN: Resolution No. 9.

(9) In view of the fact that the Zeire Zion party has been recognized as a Zionist Party by the World Zionist Organization, and in view of the fact that there is in existence in the United States a branch of the Zeire Zion the National Executive Committee is directed to give legal recognition to the Zeire Zion and to give it such rights in the Organization to which fractions are entitled, provided however that membership in the Zionist Organization of America is a condition of membership in the Zeire Zion.

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. FISHMAN: Resolution No. 10.

(10) The National Executive Committee is directed to provide its standing Palestine Committee with an advisory board of technical experts with whom the Palestine Committee shall consult on all industrial, agricultural and engineering matters.

The resolution was moved, seconded, and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. FISHMAN: Resolution No. 11.

(11) The Twenty-fourth Annual Convention of the Zionist Organization of America reaffirms our previous decisions favoring the early establishment of the American Jewish Congress on a permanent basis as a Central body of the Jewish Organizations and communities of the United States for the protection of Jewish rights wherever such rights may be denied and for action in such general Jewish matters as may require concerted action. We call upon all Zionist Districts throughout the country to give their whole-hearted support in carrying out elections for the New Congress and in promoting the objects for which it is established.

MR. FISHMAN: I move its adoption.

DELEGATE: Second the motion.

MR. GOLDBERG: I think we are all in accordance with the resolution as presented. We want to organize American Jewry. The American Jewish Congress helped the Zionist Cause very much politically and it might still be of help to us in the future. American Jewry is Zionist and the Congress is the best and only medium for expression.

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to read a paragraph from a letter from Prof. Weizmann to Mr. Richards, Secretary of the Congress Organization:

"Acknowledging your letter of April 27th, with reference to the great Jewish task of the rebuilding of a Jewish Homeland in Palestine for the furtherance of which my associates and myself have come to this country, I am glad to give renewed expression to the appreciation which we all felt of the great service which the American Jewish Congress has rendered in furthering the political aims of Zionism. The support of American Jewry through the medium of your Congress proved to be a very important factor in the achievements which we have been able to gain."

The resolution was moved, seconded, and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. FISHMAN: Resolution No. 12.

(12) WHEREAS, Young Judæa is the organization engaged in the work of Zionist propaganda and education among the Jewish youth of this country; and

WHEREAS, The efforts of Young Judæa alone have failed in this direction, with the result that the work of Zionist education among the Jewish youth of this country is seriously hampered and imperiled;

Therefore, Be It Resolved, That the Zionist Organization of America, through its Executive Committee, regional unions and several Districts, take steps to assist Young Judæa in its work of Zionist education among the Jewish youth of America.

MR. BOROFKY: I would like to make a statement in explanation of the resolution: unless the Zionists of the country rally to assist Young Judæa we are in danger of closing our office on very short notice. You have got to realize the present financial condition, and to understand that the contributions to the Keren Hayesod have affected and will affect Young Judæa's finances seriously. We have been compelled to cut our

budget two-thirds and we are living now from hand to mouth and I cannot emphasize it too much that it is the duty of every Zionist throughout the country to assist Young Judaea in getting on its own feet. We do not want any money to go from the National Organization as a subscription to Young Judaea if we can help it, but I think the Zionists can help it. The budget is very small and the cause is too great to be lost on account of lack of funds, and in asking you to vote for the resolution, I am not asking you merely to pass on it, but I am asking you actually to carry it into effect in the respective Districts from which you come.

The resolution was moved, seconded, and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. FISHMAN: Resolution No. 13.

(13) *Resolved*, That the delegates of this Convention hereby express their thanks to the City of Cleveland for the welcome extended to our delegates and visiting guests and their appreciation of the City's generous hospitality.

The resolution was moved, seconded, and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. FISHMAN: Resolution No. 14.

(14) *Resolved*, That this convention voices its appreciation of the services rendered to the Zionist cause by the Jewish Press of America.

The resolution was moved, seconded, and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. FISHMAN: Resolution No. 15.

(15) This Convention acknowledges its grateful recognition of the hospitality of the Jewish community and the Zionists of Cleveland.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should like to say one word on this. Generally this sort of resolution is adopted as a matter of course, but I want to say on this occasion, I think it is our duty to say, and I am sure that all in this hall who have worked in these very trying weeks preceding the Convention will agree, that the Jewish press has given us such support and has made the issues so clear that it has brought very much to bear on the result which we have accomplished at this Convention; especially is this true of the Yiddish dailies, and in accepting this resolution, in voting for it, please vote with the feeling that they have rendered a great and distinguished service to the cause.

The resolution was moved, seconded, and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. FISHMAN: Last, but not least, Resolution No. 16.

(16) This Convention extends its appreciation and thanks to Judge Henry J. Dannenbaum for the capable, tactful and impartial manner in which he conducted the proceedings of this Convention.

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried by unanimous vote, amid applause.

MR. AVNER: May we go on record as part of the minority group in clearly joining with that resolution?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. AVNER: The minority cannot go on record on any single resolution which has been accepted unanimously.

MR. FISHMAN: There is one resolution which was disapproved by the Committee, but because of the resolution being brought in by a group, it has been decided to read it to the Convention. It reads:

"WHEREAS, as American Zionist Medical Unit was originally assembled by Hadassah and has been fostered by Hadassah since its inception,

Be It Resolved: That this Convention recommends that the entire responsibility for the maintenance, support and administration of the American Zionist Medical Unit in Palestine, be vested in Hadassah."

MR. BOROWSKY: I move to table it.

DELEGATE: I move the adoption of the Committee's recommendation.

DR. HILKOWICH: On a substitute motion; before I introduce my substitute motion, I wish to make here a public statement that I appreciate the work of the Hadassah as much as any one man in this Convention and in America, and I hold for obvious reasons that this resolution would ask for an impossibility. I am not going to enter into an explanation, for obvious reasons. My substitute motion is that this Convention assembled recommend to the National Executive Committee at its earliest possible moment to consider that the management and policies of the American Zionist Medical Unit be vested in the World Zionist Organization. (Applause.)

MR. LIPSKY: This Convention decided a few minutes ago that it pledged allegiance to the World Zionist Organization, and when you take into account the issues that were decided in this Convention in the last days, the delegates should understand that the new administration assumes the logical consequences of the acts of the Convention. It assumes that as a matter of course the new administration is bound to act in accordance with the policy as indicated by the resolutions that have already been adopted. With regard to the allegiance to the World Zionist Organization, specifically described in the resolutions, and so forth, concerning the Medical Unit, all matters relating to it should be as a matter of course therefore referred to the Executive Committee which will act in accordance with the wishes of the Convention here. I therefore move, Mr. Chairman, that the original motion and the substitute motion should both be referred to the incoming Executive Committee.

DELEGATE: Second the motion.

DELEGATE: Question.

MRS. VIXMAN: May I, the only dissenting member of that Committee, express my opinion on that question as a delegate to this Convention? It is my opinion, as an official of the Central Committee of Hadassah, that the resolution, or the substitute resolution, in no way implies that the organization throughout the country will hurt the Zionist Organization through its membership. We remain an integral part of the Zionist Organization of America, but we women are the harmonizing element in Jewish Zionist life in America, and I believe we have been a splendid constructive force in our Jewish life in the different cities; and for that reason we ask you to remain a unified force responsible for the medical work, which will gradually become the Palestine Medical Unit work instead of the American Zionist Medical Unit work. In everything else

Hadassah works as a member of the Zionist Organization of America. Do not force us to make a split in our ranks, as there is enough dissension already. Let the Hadassah forces stand united on this great program of health work in Palestine, and you will still have us as members of the Zionist Organization of America.

(Mr. Zeldin addressed the audience in Yiddish.)

THE CHAIRMAN: I want to take the liberty of saying a word on this subject. I want to call your attention to this, that the American Zionist Medical Unit is being supported not only by the Zionist Organization of America but also in equal degree by the Joint Distribution Committee. I have been a member of the Joint Distribution Committee ever since its existence, and I know the various problems in relation to the American Zionist Medical Unit. It is a very complicated situation. The demand for control by the World Zionist Organization and this new question of it being taken over by Hadassah is one that should receive most careful and earnest consideration, and I should recommend that it would be a very erroneous thing for us to do, now that we have so little time, to discuss the matter. We should postpone this question. I am sure the incoming Executive will give most careful consideration to the matter, and I would therefore recommend that this be referred to the incoming Executive Committee—both the resolution and the substitute resolution. (Applause.)

DR. HILKOWICH: My motion does read the Convention assembled here recommend to the incoming Executive Committee to consider most seriously the problem to make the American Zionist Medical Unit under the management and its policy shall be shaped by the World Zionist Organization.

DELEGATE: We are talking about the Hadassah and about the Medical Unit. Two resolutions are before you. The first resolution is to affirm the American Medical Unit and the second resolution is to the effect that the American Medical Unit shall go under the administration of the World Zionist Organization. I am in favor of having this resolution referred to the Executive Committee for their decision. At this present date of the Convention, a question of such vital force shall not be decided here, because the Medical Unit is one of the most important works that we have done in Palestine. Why have we been against the administration? Because it was negligent. If there is one single thing that Americans have distinguished themselves in, it is the Medical Unit. (Applause.)

I want to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, ask them what they have done in Palestine; ask those who have been in Palestine, and they will tell you that there is not one single effort of Americans or of the Jews in Palestine that can compare with this excellent service of the American Medical Unit.

It may be possible that after investigation arrangements will be made to turn over the management of the Medical Unit to the World Zionist Organization. In principle, we ought to be for that, because there should be no decision of authority in Palestine and no single body should be given any particular kind of work. If you adopt a resolution contrary to the Medical Unit, you are reproaching the Medical Unit.

MR. NEUMANN: I will be very brief. I note and I fully appreciate the statement which Mrs. Vixman has made with reference to the serious

situation which will be created by action which we may take here. I think we are intelligent enough to build and not to break, and if we can possibly find the way of keeping intact the ranks of Hadassah, preserving the Medical Unit and good feeling between the World Zionist Organization and ourselves, that way should be found. Personally I differ with the ladies of Hadassah about the value of this resolution. I believe I have some knowledge of what Miss Szold's mind is on this question, and I am sorry that until now the name of that person who has done so much for American Zionism, for the Hadassah, and for the Organization, and for the World Movement, has not received sufficient consideration at the hands of this Convention. I know that Miss Szold has grave misgivings in her mind as to the possibility of keeping the Medical Unit as an institution apart. I know she has said, black on white, that there are advantages and disadvantages on both sides of the question, and I know that there are many Zionists who are in favor with their whole heart of the Medical Unit, but in the best interests of the Unit itself it ought to be under the World Zionist Organization. However, realizing as I do, the situation in Hadassah, I would be in favor of our taking action which would satisfy them if we can, and I would suggest that a resolution be adopted in favor of placing the responsibility for the Medical Unit upon the Hadassah, with the proviso that the proper arrangements should be made with the World Organization so that it would satisfy the Executive and the Commission of the World Zionist Organization. If that is possible, and I hope it may be possible, I would be in favor of taking such action. With good will on both sides I think it can be done, and I urge the resolution be accepted and modified in that way.

DR. HILKOWICH: May I be permitted to suggest through you to the Hadassah, realizing the importance of their request, that a part of the Medical Unit be put under the responsibility of the Hadassah, and that is the training school for nurses.

After further discussion the Chairman put the following resolution to the vote:

"That the resolution be referred to the incoming Executive for careful consideration."

The resolution was carried unanimously.

At this point Judge Dannenbaum entered, and was informed of the resolution which had been passed in appreciation of his services as Chairman of the Convention. Judge Dannenbaum thanked the Convention for its expression of appreciation, and before taking the chair offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the profound gratitude of the Convention is hereby expressed to the minority members of the late Executive for their brave and unremitting devotion to the principles of Zionism and loyalty to the duly accredited policies of the World Zionist Organization.

This resolution was seconded and adopted by unanimous vote.

Judge Dannenbaum then took the chair.

MR. BARONDESS: Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, one of our great and brave leaders has lately been very seriously ill. We are very happy to learn of his recovery, which we understand is complete, and upon this

occasion it seems to me that the Zionist Convention ought to record its joy, and I offer a resolution to cover that point.

"WHEREAS, it has come to our knowledge that Dr. Max Nordau has been seriously ill and has happily recovered from his illness, therefore be it

"Resolved, that we record our joy at Dr. Nordau's recovery, and that we fervently pray for his continued good health that he may continue to render his inestimable and loyal service to the cause of Zionism.

"Resolved, that the contents of this resolution be transmitted to Dr. Max Nordau by cable."

The resolution was seconded and adopted by unanimous vote.

THE CHAIRMAN then asked the Convention whether it was its sense that the resolutions to be submitted by Mr. Neumann should be read through, inasmuch as they had been read the previous evening.

MR. BARONDESS suggested that the resolutions be adopted *en masse*.

MR. NEUMANN: I am as anxious as Mr. Barondess that the resolutions be adopted without any loss of time. I think, however, that the resolutions which have been the cause of all this discussion in the past two or three months are entitled to a little closer scrutiny. The minority members have had arguments to make about the Charter of the Keren Hayesod and about how it should be changed and modified. Now is the time and this is the occasion when such suggestions are in order. I think, Mr. Chairman, we ought not to allow the impression to go forth, as it has gone forth or was created concerning the London Conference, that the Keren Hayesod resolutions had been adopted at the last moment without any opportunity for discussion. If the gentlemen of the minority had suggestions or recommendations to make, if they really meant what they said, that they want to have the charter changed and safeguards installed, if they have any instructions to give to the delegates, let them make their suggestions and recommendations right now. I plead, Mr. Chairman, those of the majority not to use their powers as a majority, but to permit the discussion of these resolutions. I do not anticipate a long debate, but if anybody has a change to suggest, a modification, let them be able to do it. Let us read the resolutions one by one and act upon them, unless there is opposition.

MR. ROTHENBERG: I desire to deal with one statement that Mr. Neumann made. He appealed not to use the power of the majority. I say that statement is incorrect, because there is no attempt being made here by the majority to use their power over the minority. The minority has put it on record that it is opposed to the entire plan as presented here, and therefore they are not sitting in discussing on this entire proposition. I agree that perhaps the better method is to read the resolutions paragraph by paragraph, and if there are no amendments, and if they are adopted, then certainly it will not be said that there was any attempt by the majority of the Convention to impose itself on the minority.

DELEGATE: I want you, fellow delegates, to understand that remarks have been made already, that the majority has railroaded this Convention. I was one who heard the remarks of the minority, and I must tell you gentlemen that you should not let this Convention give the minority the chance to go out in public and say that the majority has railroaded the

minority. Give them a chance. Let them hear what we are going to suggest and what we are going to do, and then if they will go out with the report that we have railroaded, we will be able to tell them that we have worked according to the Convention rules; we have worked with sense and honor. (Applause.)

MR. BARONDESS: I belong to the majority, and I have been in the habit of being voted down in my lifetime many times, and when I am voted down I swallow the pill and ask no more. If my motion will be defeated I will submit. If the gentleman who speaks for the minority informs us that the minority is part and parcel of us and is ready and willing to participate in this discussion, then I withdraw my motion, but if the minority tells us it is not ready and is not willing to participate in this discussion, I say that we spent enough time on the consideration of these questions. We have heard the resolutions read, and there is no point in killing time while we have other important matters to attend to.

MR. AVNER: On a point of personal privilege, I do not know the name of this gentleman, but if any person present made any such statement, he speaks without any authority. It is contrary to the wish and the belief of the minority here. We have made no such charge and will not make such charge, and if the charge is made it is against the wish and desire of the minority here. Nothing is railroaded. We are here to vote if we choose. No one has railroaded anything, and we make no such charge. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: You have heard the statement of Mr. Baroness. It is up to the minority to say whether it is their desire to offer any amendments to the various provisions of the report of the Committee.

MR. AVNER: We have put ourselves on record in the minority resolution as to our attitude and our relations toward the Keren Hayesod as now constituted. We cannot in lieu of that take any part in any discussion as to details of an institution which we believe is undemocratic, contrary to Zionist precedents. We are trying not to make speeches and take up time, and therefore we cannot with conscience take part in the discussion on the change of something which we believe has no right to be discussed in this Convention. You may disagree with me, gentlemen and members. We have consciences. Our minority resolution states our position. We regret we cannot vote for the adoption of the majority resolution in block, and will have to be recorded as opposing the majority resolution in block. As to suggestions, Judge Mack told us one thing, each and every Zionist has his conscience and has a right to it. If I want to make a confession to the Pope, it is my privilege.

DR. WOLF: As a member of the minority I wish to state that my friend, Mr. Avner, spoke for the minority resolution; he is referring to the past. I wish to go on record as a man who wants to co-operate in everything good to further the purposes of the Zionists. Judge Mack will not say anything as to what will be done in the future. Our resolution of the minority refers to the past as far as the Keren Hayesod is constituted, and as constituted at present it will remain so until the Congress in Carlsbad will change it. Nevertheless I have been elected on the platform of anti-Keren Hayesod. I have a right to hear the suggestions made to-day which will make the Keren Hayesod acceptable to us, when adopted by the Congress. I have a moral right, I have the

duty to come to you when I find something that can bring us nearer to one another. (Applause.) I am against Keren Hayesod as it has been constituted after the London Conference without the authorization of the London Conference as to principle. I am against the Keren Hayesod until the Congress will pass upon it. When it will pass upon it and adopt it, I will abide by it. I found one point to-day on which I must congratulate Mr. Neumann. I told him to-day that the resolutions that were presented by him were nothing but a victory of the minority fraction. It is our moral victory that this principle has been expounded by Mr. Neumann. I found one point of the greatest importance that you have overlooked, and this point is the vesting of the control in the Zionist Congress or the Executive Committee. The vote had it fifty to fifty. If the Board of Directors are elected fifty by the contributors and fifty by the Executive Committee of the Zionist Congress, there is no control. It will be taking it from one side to the other. I told Mr. Neumann that if you want to have peace when the Keren Hayesod will be an instrument in the entire Zionist world, to make it so that the control will be vested in the Congress with 51 per cent and we will have no trouble and no squabbles. We can work that out at Carlsbad without further discrimination and criticism. Mr. Neumann saw the point at once, and he absolutely consented to my suggestion, and I take great pleasure as a member of the minority to suggest to you the change of this control so as to make it 51 against 49. (Applause.)

MR. BARONDESS: I want to make a statement in view of the statement just made by my good friend Dr. Wolf. I beg to withdraw my motion, even if it is to win Dr. Wolf himself.

MR. NEUMANN: In regard to those specific points raised by Dr. Wolf of St. Louis, I should like very much to have such additional suggestions as the ladies and gentlemen have to offer, because I believe that Dr. Wolf is acting entirely in the right spirit, in the spirit of helpful co-operation, and we welcome additional suggestions from the minority as well as the majority. (Applause.) I want to say in regard to the specific point made by Dr. Wolf, that we should vest the absolute control, namely, the majority control, in the Zionist Organization, that this is a point which I believe the members of the Committee would unanimously accept. The Committee cannot meet now. It is impossible to meet now and reconsider that resolution. Only I think I can say on behalf of the Chairman of the Committee and myself and others, inasmuch as these are recommendations to the delegates to the Zionist Congress, as a basis for the new charter, that they will give the Executive Committee pledges, that they will give consideration at the next meeting to this point of the majority control of the Zionist Organization. I think with the unanimous consent of the house we can accept the recommendation. I shall so modify the resolution as soon as I get a chance. I shall read the resolutions. The first has been read and adopted. The second resolution reads:

"We regard the Keren Hayesod as the central fund of the Zionist Organization, under the control of the Zionist Congress, acting through the World Zionist Executive Committee—collected upon the principle of Maaser—for the purpose of securing the support and co-operation of all Jews in laying the foundation of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, and which all Federations and separate units (*sunderferlander*)

are under obligation to support, it being understood that the controlling interest in the Keren Hayesod shall be vested exclusively in the Zionist Congress and its legally constituted authorities and instrumentalities."

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried.

MR. NEUMANN: Resolution No. 3:

(3) "We direct the National Executive Committee to accept the invitation extended to our organization to co-operate with the Keren Hayesod Bureau for the United States of America, established by the representatives of the World Zionist Organization, and of the Keren Hayesod, and to provide for the proper representation on such boards or committees as have been or may hereafter be constituted to direct the activities of the Keren Hayesod in this country."

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried, the minority voting.

(Mr. Avner of Pittsburgh and Mr. Palthiel of Providence voted against the resolution.)

MR. NEUMANN: Resolution No. 4.

(4) "We hereby call upon all Zionist Districts and all Zionists to proceed at once with the work for the Keren Hayesod, in order that *without delay* the foundation of the Jewish National Home in Palestine may be laid, in accordance with the policies of the World Zionist Organization."

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried.

MR. NEUMANN: Resolution No. 5:

(5) "Resolution brought in by the Zeire Zion and recommended for adoption:

"The Twenty-fourth Annual Zionist Convention resolves that the Keren Hayesod, while remaining under the control of the World Zionist Organization, shall be so constituted that it shall function here in America as a democratic agency, and that, with that end in view, provision shall be made for the participation in the management of the Keren Hayesod Bureau, of all Jewish groups, parties, and organizations desirous of co-operating in the work."

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried, the minority voting.

MR. NEUMANN: Resolution No. 7:

(7) "The Committee on Keren Hayesod, having given careful consideration to the 'Memorandum on the Legal Status of the Keren Hayesod,' submitted by the Head Office of the Keren Hayesod in London, for the consideration of our organization, with a view to reaching an understanding regarding the permanent form of organization of the Keren Hayesod at the forthcoming Zionist Congress,

"Recommend that the Convention approve the following suggestions contained in that Memorandum, and instruct our delegates to the forthcoming Zionist Congress to endeavor to bring about the permanent organization of the Keren Hayesod, on the basis of these recommendations:

"1. Contributions to the Keren Hayesod are to be organized by countries;

"2. In each country, or group of countries, an annual gathering of contributors or certificate holders, or their representatives, shall take place. These gatherings shall, in turn, elect representatives to the Council

of the Keren Hayesod. For these elections, each certificate holder shall have *one vote and no more*—the number of representatives to the Council to be fixed in accordance with the aggregate of the country's contributions to the Keren Hayesod.

3. "The Council shall meet at least once a year, and unless otherwise decided by the Directors, it shall meet at the place where the Head Office of the Keren Hayesod is situated.

"4. The annual meeting of the Council shall be entitled:

"a—To consider and pass the balance sheet of the Corporation;

"b—To consider and pass proposals of the Directors, regarding any payments of dividend to certificate holders;

"c—To conduct elections for the appointment of:

"1—Half the Board of Directors (49 per cent of the Board of Directors or equivalent of that—not more than 49 per cent).

"2—The whole Board of Trustees.

"5. The major part of the Board of Directors, including the managing director, shall be appointed by the Executive of the Zionist Organization, who shall have the right, at any time, to withdraw any Director they have appointed, and replace him by another. In this way, the Keren Hayesod is to maintain the character of an all-Jewish institution, and, at the same time, ensure the connection with the Zionist Organization, and preserve the influence of the latter for the Keren Hayesod.

"6. In accordance with the above, the Charter of the Keren Hayesod shall be so amended, that the rights of contributors or certificate holders, as members in the Keren Hayesod, shall be specifically guaranteed by the Charter and statutes thereof."

These recommendations were contained in the typewritten memorandum and read before our presiding officers in the Executive Committee meeting on Saturday night, April 9th, and read to them.

MR. AVNER: May I challenge that statement? To the best of my recollection, Judge Mack, at some time Saturday night, April 9th, or some time Sunday morning, April 10th, stated that during the course of his negotiations with Dr. Weizmann, he handed sheets of what purported to be the Statutes of the Keren Hayesod, that he had not yet had the chance to go into the voluminous package of documents that were handed to him. As an individual member of the National Executive, I had the good fortune to meet Dr. Levin at Pittsburgh, and he suggested if I wanted a copy of the Statutes of the Keren Hayesod he would be glad to wire to Chicago or to Mr. Neumann in New York, and either of them would send me a copy of the Statutes. In the hotel at Pittsburgh a question was asked whether or not a copy of these Statutes had been turned over to the New York office. Dr. Levin said no, for the reason that since the memorandum had been made public, the draft was not turned over to the New York office, and he would renew his efforts to get us a copy through Mr. Rubin or Mr. Neumann. When I did get a copy of the Statute it was a copy of the two parts of the Statutes. I as a member of the Executive had never even seen a printed or typewritten statement of the memorandum or the article attached to that Statute about which Mr. Neumann has spoken.

MR. NEUMANN: I repeat that that typewritten memorandum was brought to this country by the delegates when they came on board ship. Dr. Mossensohn handed it to me in the office. At that meeting, on April 9th, it was requested of me that I turn it over to Mr. Stone; Dr. Mossensohn and he handed it to Dr. Weizmann and Judge Mack. There was opportunity to ask for the thing which has never been asked for. I announced from the platform, on Sunday evening, the night before Professor Frankfurter spoke on this matter, that we had here copies of that memorandum, and no one of the minority has asked to have it read before they made their declaration. If this be a victory of the minority, very well. I am happy that they feel that way about it. I wish to repeat that this was the recommendation brought by the delegation from London and sent by the officers of our Organization before the public controversy started.

The memorandum was sent to us by the head office of the Keren Hayesod with suggestions to be constructed by us so that our delegates to the forthcoming Zionist Congress will have previously deliberated upon these questions and could come there with definite conclusions as to what the permanent form of the organization shall be.

MR. SENN: With reference to this I would state that the members of our District, the North Philadelphia District, applied to the Zionist Organization of America, 55 Fifth Avenue, for a copy of the Statutes of the Keren Hayesod, and we received it.

After further discussion, the Chairman called on Mr. Neumann to proceed with the reading of the resolutions.

Mr. Neumann reread Resolution No. 7.

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. NEUMANN: Resolution No. 8:

(8) "The Convention declares that, in the interest of the Cause, it is essential that the controversy over the Keren Hayesod in this country, publicly engaged in by opposing groups within the Zionist Organization of America, shall forthwith come to an end. The resolutions on the Keren Hayesod, adopted at this Convention, call for complete and unstinted co-operation on the part of all Zionists, regardless of their views as individuals, so that the constructive work in Palestine may suffer no further delay, and we affirm our deep conviction that the example set by the members of the Zionist Organization of America, in giving their whole-hearted support to the Keren Hayesod, will be followed by the Jews of America at large, and that through the Keren Hayesod the Jews of this country will make their maximum contribution for the upbuilding of Erez Israel.

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried by unanimous vote.

MR. NEUMANN: There is one more resolution—No. 6:

"Whereas, the resolution adopted at the London Conference specifically provide that 'at least 20 per cent of the funds collected by the Keren Hayesod shall be given to the Jewish National Fund,' and 'of the further funds collected, not more than one-third shall be spent in current expenditure for education, social welfare, immigration, and similar purposes in Palestine, for the building up of the Jewish National Home; while,

at least two-thirds are to be invested in permanent national institutions or economic undertakings,' and 'That the holders of certificates will participate in the administration of the fund and in the revenue of the economic undertakings established by the fund,' and

"Whereas, the Jews of America may, and should be expected, in view of their relative economic position, to forego any gains or emoluments that may be derived from the economic undertakings of the Keren Hayesod.

"We call upon and urge all Jews contributing to the Keren Hayesod to designate their contributions as free offerings, assigning to the World Zionist Organization any and all of their property rights in the Keren Hayesod, reserving to themselves all other rights as members.

"And we direct the incoming Executive Committee of the Zionist Organization of America to take the necessary steps to carry out the purpose of this resolution."

MR. NEUMANN: I move its adoption.

DELEGATE: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those in favor of the adoption of the resolution will signify by saying Aye; those opposed say No.

MR. SOLOMON: I desire to move that resolution be amended so that any person who insists that the contributions shall be partly for investment shall have a right to state what part of his contribution is not for investment so that he may get the advantage on his income tax.

MR. NEUMANN: This is the intention of the resolution. It is an exhortation to the Jews that they should turn back to the Zionist Movement whatever money might accrue to them as an investment in the Keren Hayesod. We have no right to curtail the right of any persons to receive the full benefits of the Keren Hayesod contribution. This is left to the Executive Committee to work out.

MR. ROSENBLATT: I would move to refer this to the incoming Executive Committee. This is one single point in which I believe that the minority had a fair case. I believe that in America the appeal could be more effective, morally as well as practically, if it were entirely a free will offering, a donation fund. I ought to add just one word. We had quite a debate in the Committee. The intention is not that the Fund be used for purely unproductive purposes, even in an educational fund. The proceeds may be used for productive purposes, and for water power and development, such as terminals, tramways and public concessions, but I feel that in America it would be more effective if we could not say to A B C remaining contributors that you are going to get any return of twenty-five or fifty per cent of what you gave us, and we say whatever you give us is a free will offering on the real old principle of Maaser, on the principle of ten per cent on which you expect no return. Of course, I am commingling arguments here because the Maaser principle, the minority would not willingly accept. I accept that principle but the Maaser principle involves a principle that the giver expects no return from his gift. On that basis, and because I believe I understand a little of our American Jewish psychology, if I may use that much abused term, we could get better results. I do not think that now and at this time we are in a proper condition to decide this proposition; I think it ought to be put to

the Executive Committee to study it and come to the conclusion. I suggest it be referred to the Executive Committee.

The Chairman then put to the vote the resolution as read by Mr. Neumann. The resolution was carried.

The suggestion made by Mr. Rosenblatt was then put before the Convention in the form of a resolution, which was moved, seconded and defeated by 39 votes to 31.

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the Organization Committee.

MR. BOROWSKY: I should like to point out that some of the members of the minority were on this Committee, and they approved the report with the majority. The following are the resolutions:

(1) "BE IT RESOLVED, That the incoming Executive Committee be authorized to make all the necessary changes regarding the present status and organization of districts and regions as well as regulate the question of dues, and that such change and modification be submitted by the Executive Committee for a referendum vote by the Zionist districts not later than December 1, 1921."

Objections to this resolution as presented were raised by Mr. Avner, who submitted that the powers thus vested in the Executive Committee did not lie within the constitution of the Zionist Organization of America.

After an explanation by Mr. Lipsky as to the real intent of the paragraph, it was decided to change the text of the resolution to read "the Executive Committee be authorized to present all the necessary changes" in place of "the Executive be authorized to make all the necessary changes."

The resolution in this form was moved, seconded and carried.

MR. BOROWSKY: The second part of the resolution.

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the incoming Executive Committee be instructed to formulate a plan whereby definite status be given in the Organization to the Order Sons of Zion, Hadassah, Young Judaea, Intercollegiate Zionist Organization, Zeire Zion, and such other groups as are engaged in special Zionist activities."

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried.

MR. BOROWSKY: Paragraph 3:

"BE IT RESOLVED, That the Executive Committees shall be authorized, if found necessary, to accept additional members to the extent of 25 per cent of its membership and to elect all the necessary officers."

By that we mean that for the present we understand the minority is not ready to go on the Executive Committee. It may be found in the course of time that some of the members may change their minds. Furthermore, there is a possibility of the Executive desiring to give representation to Hadassah, Order Sons of Zion and the other groups previously mentioned, and unless we make provision the Executive will not be in a position to do so. As regards the election of necessary officers, I believe that needs no explanation. Every person of responsibility in the organization is an officer, and the Executive Committee, simply as a matter of computation, is the only body in the organization that has a right to bind such officer.

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried.

MR. BOROWSKY: Paragraph 4:

"**BE IT RESOLVED**, That this Convention goes on record enforcing the principle adopted at the Chicago Convention, that the majority of the members of the National Executive Committee shall be elected by a direct vote of the Zionists and direct the Executive to work out the details of putting this plan in operation."

When that particular provision was made, it was understood that it was to go into effect within a year, I believe. At the Buffalo Convention, if I am not mistaken, it was tabled indefinitely.

MR. SHULMAN: The Chicago Convention adopted resolutions that the major portion of the members of the National Executive Committee shall be elected by a direct vote. The Buffalo Convention adopted resolutions postponing it for one year. We are confronted at this Convention with a unique state of affairs. Our entire Executive has resigned. If they had not resigned it would have been possible for us to commence putting that plan in operation at once, because we would have had an executive to tide over until the new Executive is elected. We cannot adjourn this Convention without placing the organization in charge of some responsible authority, and therefore this Convention is obliged as a matter of necessity to elect its Executive. Now this resolution provides that we make it obligatory upon the incoming executive at the first possible opportunity to put this plan into operation, which will mean that either before the next convention or at the next convention the majority will be elected by a direct vote, and when they will be elected the minority of the members of the Executive will be those that are going to be elected at this Convention, otherwise we disband without an Executive. I therefore move the adoption of the resolution as presented.

The resolution was seconded and carried.

MR. BOROWSKY: The following resolution was voted by the Committee in consultation with the Committee on Nominations. It introduces a radical change in the composition of our administration.

"In order to provide a more democratic form of administration of the affairs of the Organization there shall be elected by this Convention an administrative committee of seven inclusive of the Treasurer and General Secretary of the Organization.

"This committee shall be invested with the power to administer the affairs of the Organization in accordance with the powers given to the Administrative Committee by the Constitution, subject to the control and authority of the National Executive Committee.

"The members of this Committee shall be members of the National Executive Committee without vote on matters involving their own action.

"This committee may accept two additional members and elect its own chairman with the approval of the National Executive Committee."

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried.

MR. AVNER: The minority at no time discussed the questions of organization and reorganization, and we, the minority, as individuals, believe the incoming Executive should be charged with full responsibility and should have the right to frame their own form of organization which will be responsible for the administration.

MR. BOROWSKY: Paragraph 6:

"RESOLVED, That all provisions of the Constitution in conflict herewith are hereby repealed and this resolution is hereby substituted in lieu thereof."

The resolution was moved, seconded and carried.

MR. SHULMAN: May I for the sake of the record say that this resolution was adopted by a two-thirds vote, in favor 112, opposed none; unanimous.

THE CHAIRMAN: The next order of business is the report of the committee on nominations.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman and Fellow Delegates: We have reached the most momentous hour in the Zionist Organization of America. I can only feel that this hour corresponds to the hour of Nilah, and while you have heard here a thousand questions presented and a thousand legal arguments made, to me there is but one issue. That issue is, the destiny of the Jewish people and the glorification of Erez Israel. (Applause.) I have heard people saying that they have cried at this Convention: is there a single one of us who has not been moved by the drama that has happened? Could any one of us restrain our tears? Only once before in my life have I witnessed such a scene, and that was at the Zionist Convention in Basle, Switzerland, when Dr. Herzl presided for the last time over that Congress. It came in the wake of the pogroms which had shed so much Jewish blood, and the great Government of England offered us Uganda; but there were a group of loyal Zionists who said, 'We do not want Uganda, we want Palestine and nothing but Palestine.' (Applause.) We gave up Uganda, but we saved Palestine. (Applause.) I am profoundly sorry that we have had to give something up here in America. But the price is worth it if we can save Erez Israel, for the Jewish people. Make no mistake about that. We do not want to Russianize Palestine, but we don't want to Americanize it either. (Applause.) We want a Palestine that will take in every Jew and be a Jewish Homeland for all of the Jewish people no matter where they are now, whether it is at Pinsk or at Washington. We are loyal Americans 100 per cent, but we are Jews, and we want to save our culture for our Jewish people.

I submit the nominations:

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

PETER J. SCHWEITZER, Treasurer, New York City.
LOUIS LIPSKY, General Secretary, New York City.
ABRAHAM GOLDBERG, New York City.
LOUIS ROBISON, New York City.
BERNARD A. ROSENBLATT, New York City.
MORRIS ROTHENBERG, New York City.
HERMAN CONHEIM, New York City.

NEW YORK MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

S. ABEL	SOLOMON LAMPORT
JOSEPH BARONDESS	MORRIS MARGULIES
WILLIAM EDLIN	EMANUEL NEUMANN
JACOB FISHMAN	H. H. MASLIANSKY
BORIS GRABELSKY	BERNARD R. RICHARDS
ISRAEL GOLDBERG	BERNARD SHELVIN
MISS LOTTA LEVINSOHN	DAVID WERBELOWSKY

S. J. WEINSTEIN

OUT OF TOWN MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MAX AMDUR, Pittsburgh, Pa.	FRED LUBIN, Chicago, Ill.
RABBI SAMUEL BENJAMIN, Cleveland, Ohio	DR. S. M. MELAMED, Chicago, Ill.
A. B. COHEN, Scranton, Pa.	SAMUEL NATHANSON, New Haven, Conn.
JUDGE HENRY J. DANNENBAUM, Houston, Texas	LEONARD M. PALITZ, Savannah, Ga.
REV. MEYER FREED, Worcester, Mass.	BENJAMIN RABALSKY, Boston, Mass.
D. GARA, Cleveland, Ohio	ABR. M. REES, Pittsburgh, Pa.
HERMAN GESSNER, Escanaba, Mich.	A. P. ROSENBERG, Milwaukee, Wisc.
JACOB GINSBERG, Philadelphia	M. G. ROSENBERG, Ybor City, Fla.
ABR. GOLDSTEIN, Hartford, Conn.	JACOB SAKS, Norfolk, Va.
BENJ. L. GORDON, Philadelphia, Pa.	MAX SHULMAN, Chicago, Ill.
ISAAC HARRIS, Boston, Mass.	CHARLES SPIVAK, Denver, Colo.
JOSEPH HIRSHFIELD, Kinston, N. C.	H. STEINBERG, Chicago, Ill.
B. HORWICH, Chicago, Ill.	LOUIS TOPKIS, Wilmington, Del.
AARON LEVINSTONE, Newark, N. J.	SAMUEL TRAVIS, Tulsa, Okla.
	M. J. WISOTSKY, Los Angeles, Cal.

MEMBERS OF GREATER ACTIONS COMMITTEE

MAX SHULMAN, Chicago, Ill.
 PETER J. SCHWEITZER, New York
 MORRIS ROTHENBERG, New York
 BERNARD A. ROSENBLATT, New York
 LOUIS ROBISON, Mount Vernon, New York

Exclusive of the following members elected at the Buffalo Convention: Aran Goldberg, Mrs. Mary Fels, and Louis Lipsky.

At the conclusion of the reading it was pointed out from the floor that various States and important cities did not have any representation on the list of the Executive Committee as constituted.

A discussion ensued during which the following additional names were proposed and seconded for inclusion on the Executive Committee.

MISS HENRIETTA SZOLD
 MR. BLOOM, Gary, Ind.
 MR. REUBEN BRAININ
 MR. MORRIS COHEN, New Britain, Conn.
 DR. JACOB H. KAPLAN, Cincinnati.

Mr. Lipsky pointed out that it had been impossible, owing to the nature of the Convention, to arrange for a secret ballot for the elections to the Executive Committee. He asked the indulgence of the Convention in view of the fact that the outgoing administration had not prepared for the carrying out of such a ballot: the method now proposed was the only one feasible under the circumstances.

An amendment was offered by Mr. Silverman that the names which had been proposed and seconded during the course of the discussion should be added to the list of the Executive Committee, which should then be adopted.

The amendment was seconded and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will now have the report of the Publication Committee.

MR. JACOB GINSBERG, of Philadelphia :

REPORT ON COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATIONS

This committee having carefully considered the subject placed before it for consideration has decided to make the following recommendations.

We believe that the spoken and the written word will, through the years of our future intensive work, remain the most effective instrument in promoting our aim of a restored Palestine. We are, therefore, of the opinion that the Zionist periodicals and publications must be maintained and strengthened with the object of enlightening and arousing the Jews of America as to their duty to the Jewish National ideal. We further believe that the Zionist publications whether they are published directly as official organs or issued otherwise by co-operating associations should not merely be the mouthpiece of the Zionist Administration but the mediums of expression of all phases of opinion in the Zionist movement.

We accordingly recommend :

1. That we continue to co-operate with and to assist the association which is publishing *Dos Yiddishe Folke* in such ways as may be in keeping with our resources and as may be decided by the incoming Executive Committee.
2. That the publication of *The New Palestine* be continued and issued as a weekly publication devoted to the most important and vital activities and events pertaining to the work of reconstruction in Palestine.
3. That we take steps to form a publishing association of Zionists especially interested in that task to continue the publication of the *New Maccabæan* as an English-Jewish weekly publication designed as a vigorous organ of Jewish opinion and devoted to the furtherance of the Zionist ideal.
4. That we take steps to form a publishing association of Zionists to renew the publishing of the *Hatoren* as a weekly magazine and that we give such association our moral and financial support, keeping within our resources, as may be decided by the incoming Executive Committee and that until such association is formed the *Hatoren* be continued as a monthly magazine by the Zionist Organization of America.
5. That the Zionist Organization of America continue to publish the *Young Judea* as heretofore as the official organ of Young Judea.
6. That the Publishing Association of the *Hatoren*, if such be organized as indicated in Article 4, may be also authorized to publish a Hebrew weekly magazine for Jewish children on a similar basis as provided for the publishing of the *Hatoren*.

A discussion ensued on this report, particularly in regard to the question of the publication of a Hebrew weekly magazine for children. It was the opinion of some delegates that the last paragraph of the resolution should so be altered as to make this publication obligatory and not optional.

MR. BARONDESS defended the resolution as it stood on the grounds that it would be proper to leave this question to the consideration of those members of the Executive who understood the value of Hebrew publications and the advisability of the various periodicals proposed.

MR. RICHARDS urged the acceptance of the report in view of the fact that while it was impossible to go then into a detailed discussion, the reso-

lution did fulfil the primary purpose of stressing the importance of the printed word in propaganda and did support the main publications already in existence.

At the close of the discussion the resolution as above worded was put to the vote and carried.

THE CHAIRMAN: The report of the Budget Committee.

REPORT OF THE BUDGET COMMITTEE

MR. ROBISON: The Budget Committee had two sessions and decided that in the light of the action taken by the Convention, they find themselves unable at this time to set up a budget even after carefully considering the reports of the Organization Committee and the Publications Committee. They have, therefore, resolved to appoint a committee consisting of the following who will set up a budget which it will in turn submit to the other members of the Budget Committee for their approval:

Louis Braines, Perth Amboy; David Surdut, New York; B. Rabalsky, Boston; Boris Grabelsky, New York; Herman Conheim, New York; Peter J. Schweitzer, New York; Louis Robison, New York.

This committee will be assisted in its work by Mr. Reuben Horchow. Upon acceptance of this budget by the majority of the Budget Committee they will submit same to the incoming Executive Committee for final approval.

It was moved, seconded and carried that the report of the Budget Committee be adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN then called upon Mr. Ussischkin to address the Convention.

MR. USSISCHKIN: Zionism owes much to the Jewish people, who nurtured and sustained it. Few, however, pause long enough to reflect how much the Jewish people owe to Zionism, how much Zionism has contributed to the ennobling of the Jewish spirit. To recount all that the Jews owe to Zionism would take too much time, and would perhaps be superfluous. Those things are easily understood by all who have followed the trend of Jewish life since Zionism, as a political movement, has come to the fore.

Zionism has set a goal for the Jewish people. It has given them something to look forward to, to pray and to hope for, to rejoice and to grieve over. It has set a definite goal towards which the eyes of Jewry have longingly turned. It has lifted the Jew out of the sordid realities of his daily life and filled him with solicitude over something which, while physically remote, has claimed the noblest of Jewish longings.

Zionism has given a language to the Jewish people. Hebrew as a spoken, living language, has marched side by side with the regeneration of the Jewish soil and Jewish soul. This achievement in itself would justify the labors and the struggle, the sacrifices and the disappointments with which Zionist work has been invested. It would have been impossible to speak of a Jewish renaissance if it had not been for those who have blazed the path and made of Hebrew the tongue with which Jewish Palestine is to-day alive.

Zionism has given a flag to the Jewish people. A symbol of Jewish unity, it would not have been born had not the idea of Jewish unity

been the basis of Zionism. Zionism as a political movement was still in its infancy when the Talith was unfolded and its colors declared most appropriate as symbolic of Jewish regeneration. By that act we have become a people with ever increasing opportunities to occupy one day a worthy place among the nations of the World.

These things were brought about by the Zionist movement. How much more do the Jews as a people stand to gain now that Zionism is no longer a movement but a political reality, sanctioned by the Powers and upheld by every conscious Jew?

THE CHAIRMAN called upon Dr. Mossinsohn to deliver the closing speech of the Convention.

DR. MOSSINSOHN: You delegates who will now return home will perhaps find it difficult to explain everything that took place at the convention and will perhaps find your greatest obstacle in the word "safeguards." I want to state that there is only one safeguard. That safeguard is mutual trust. If we trust one another safeguard is good enough. But if there is no mutual trust between us not all the safeguards in the world will avail us anything.

Certain events in the recent history of Palestine have taught us this. There was a time when the purchase of land was practically impossible: that was under Turkish rule. In most of the colonies the whole of the land was therefore held by a single purchaser: and individual owners who had put their money and energy into the acquisition of land had no official record of their purchase. Only in the so-called "Colony Book," the Hebrew register, was there any mention of their purchase, or any statement as to the rightful ownership of the land. And yet, in all the thirty-five years of the life of these colonies, there is no record of a single dispute regarding rightful ownership. This was the achievement of mutual trust. These people knew of one another that they had come to build in comradeship and not to embezzle.

Now we are banded in comradeship to build up Palestine: and one thing more that I want you to understand is that we have no fear of Russification. Perhaps amongst the first generation there will be a feeling of strangeness, because it was drawn from many countries and has known diverse conditions, but the children of that generation, who will have passed through the crucible of the Palestinian school will little remember and still less feel that diversity of origin. Even the first generation of Chaluzim, a generation of men who labor in the same fields, are burned by the same sun, will soon forget whence they came, and remember only whither they have come, will remember only the single aim that inspired their coming. And, as if closer ties yet had been wanting, the blood that has been shed will fuse the men and women of the first generation to one another and their country.

I fear that the question of origin and extraction will be played out here, as witness these debates. But go forward without fear. Remember only the common cause for which you work, and the knowledge of our part and the hope of our glorious future will give you strength to bear the tremendous burdens you have assumed.

The Chairman then declared the 24th Annual Convention of the Zionist Organization of America closed, sine die.

DELEGATES AT CLEVELAND CONVENTION

<i>Name</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>District Represented</i>
Senior Abel	New York City.....	New London, Conn.
Isaac Abelson	Birmingham, Ala.	Birmingham, Ala.
Joseph Adler	Stamford, Conn.	Stamford, Conn.
A. Abramowitz	Ft. Worth, Tex.	Waco, Texas
Israel Alpert	New York City.....	Dist. 13, N. Y.
Dr. Ph. Alstat	New York City.....	White Plains, N. Y.
Joseph Altschuler	Youngstown, O.	Youngstown, O.
Maurice L. Avner.....	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Joseph Barondess	New York City.....	Patchogue, L. I.
Moses Baroway	Baltimore, Md.	Baltimore, Md.
Minnette Baum	Ft. Wayne, Ind.	Ft. Wayne, Ind.
Herman Beck	Kingston, N. Y.	Kingston, N. Y.
Samuel Benjamin	Cleveland, Ohio	Cleveland, Ohio
Garfield A. Berlinsky...	Baltimore, Md.	Cumberland, Md.
Maurice Bernon	Cleveland, O.	Cleveland, O.
Samuel Blitz	New York City	Chisholm, Buhl, Kinney, Minn.
Isaac Bloom	Gary, Ind.	Gary, Ind.
Samuel S. Bloom.....	Phila., Pa.	Germantown Dist., Phila., Pa.
Mrs. Aaron I. Blotcky...	Des Moines, Iowa	Des Moines, Iowa
Isidor Blum	Baltimore, Md.	Hagerstown, Md.
Samuel Blum	Columbia, S. C.	Columbia, S. C.
Samuel J. Borowsky...	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dist. 17, B'klyn, N. Y.
Louis Braines	Perth Amboy, N. J....	Perth Amboy, N. J.
Samuel Brill	Bensonhurst, B'klyn, N. Y.	Dist. 19, B'klyn, N. Y.
Maurice Bugenstein ...	Cedar Rapids, Ia.	Cedar Rapids, Ia.
Judge Maurice Bernon...	Cleveland, Ohio	Cleveland, Ohio
Alexander W. Burmon...	Roxbury, Mass.	Roxbury, Mass.
Abraham M. Calmenson...	St. Paul, Minn.	St. Paul, Minn.
Isaac Carmel	Cleveland, Ohio	Monticello, N. Y.
L. Charash	Norway, Mich.	Iron Mt. Mich. Dist.
Dr. Adolph Coblenz....	Baltimore, Md.	Petersburg, Va.
Rev. Nathan Colish....	Washington, D. C....	Washington, D. C.
Herman Conheim	New York City.....	Dist. 8, N. Y.
Miss Rose Cramer.....	Monessen, Pa.	Monessen, Pa.
Mrs. Emil Crockin	Baltimore, Md.	Baltimore, Md.
Judge Henry J. Dan-		
nenbaum, Texas, Texas
Mrs. Ida Danziger	New York City.....	Madison, Wisconsin
Jacob de Haas	New York City.....	Dist. 10, N. Y.

<i>Name</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>District Represented</i>
David Diamond	Buffalo, N. Y.	Buffalo, N. Y.
Harry Diamond	Pottsville, Pa.	Pottsville, Pa.
J. J. Drey	Iron River, Mich.	Iron River, Mich.
Isador Dubin	East Chicago, Ind.	Calumet, Ind.
Louis Edelman	Montgomery, Ala.	Montgomery, Ala.
Wm. Edlin	New York City	Virginia, Minn.
Rabbi M. M. Eichler	Buffalo, N. Y.	Buffalo, N. Y.
Henry Eiser	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dist. 24, N. Y.
H. Ellis	Watertown, N. Y.	Watertown, N. Y.
Rabbi M. Emdin	Evansville, Ind.	Evansville, Ind.
Moses P. Epstein	Far Rockaway, L. I.	Dist. 20, N. Y.
Louis Feinberg	Cincinnati, Ohio	Cincinnati, Ohio
A. Fine	Marquette, Mich.	Marquette, Mich.
I. Finkel	Allentown, Pa.	Allentown, Pa.
Max J. Finkelstein	Scranton, Pa.	Scranton, Pa.
Wm. K. Finkler	South Norwalk, Conn.	South Norwalk, Conn.
H. H. Fisher	Shreveport, La.	North Louisiana Dist.
Jacob Fishman	New York City	Elizabeth, N. J.
Felix Frankfurter	Cambridge, Mass.	Kansas City, Mo.
Rev. Meyer Freed	Worcester, Mass.	Worcester, Mass.
Rev. Joseph Freedman	Springfield, Mass.	Springfield, Mass.
Samuel J. Freedman	Bayonne, N. J.	Bayonne, N. J.
Harry W. Freeman	Houston, Tex.	San Antonio, Texas
A. H. Fromenson	New York City	New Brunswick, N. J.
Jos. R. Freifeld	Aiken, S. C.	Aiken, S. C.
Dr. Edgar B. Fried- enwald	Baltimore, Md.	Annapolis, Md.
Dr. Harry Friedenwald	Baltimore, Md.	Baltimore, Md.
M. Friedman	Pawtucket, R. I.	Pawtucket, R. I.
Jos. Gabriel	Jersey City, N. J.	Jersey City, N. J.
Meyer Gallin	Akron, Ohio	Akron, Ohio
Jacob Ginsburg	Philadelphia, Pa.	South West Phila. Dist.
Rabbi Simon Glazer	Kansas City, Mo.	Topeka, Mo.
Meyer Goldberg	New York City	Dist. 11, N. Y.
Abraham Goldberg	New York City	Eveleth, Minn.
H. Goldin	Atlanta, Ga.	Atlanta, Ga.
Joseph Goldman	Charleston, S. C.	Augusta, Ga.
Rabbi Solomon Gold- man	Cleveland, Ohio	Cleveland, Ohio
Mrs. Louis Goldring	Buffalo, N. Y.	Beaufort, S. C.
Louis Goldring	Buffalo, N. Y.	Buffalo, N. Y.
Jonas Goldsmith	New Britain, Conn.	New Britain, Conn.
Abraham Goldstein	Hartford, Conn.	Hartford, Conn.
Elias Goodstein	Uniontown, Pa.	Uniontown, Pa.
Dr. Benj. Gordon	Philadelphia, Pa.	South Phila. District
Dr. G. J. Gordon	Minneapolis, Minn.	Minneapolis, Minn.
Boris Grabelsky	New York City	Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
Max L. Grant	Providence, R. I.	Providence, R. I.
Max Gray	Amsterdam, N. Y.	Amsterdam, N. Y.
A. Greenberg	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dist. 29, B'klyn, N. Y.

<i>Name</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>District Represented</i>
Mrs. Caroline Green-		
field	New York City.....	Tyler, Texas
Louis J. Gribetz	New York City.....	District 2
Mrs. Max Guggen-		
heimer	Lynchburg, Va.	Lynchburg, Va.
J. L. Hahn	Roanoke, Va.	Roanoke, Va., Dist.
Benjamin M. Halpern..	West Hoboken, N. J..	North Hudson Dist., N. J.
Isaac Harris	Boston, Mass.	Malden, Mass.
Mrs. Isaac Harris.....	Boston, Mass.	Mattapan, Mass., Dist. 6
Wm. Hauser	Flint, Mich.	Flint, Mich.
Wm. Heist	Toledo, Ohio	Toledo, Ohio
Rabbi Hecht	Yonkers, N. Y.	Yonkers, N. Y.
A. M. Heller	New York City.....	Duluth, Minn.
Dr. M. A. Helfgott....	Sioux City, Ia.	Sioux City, Ia.
Dr. A. M. Hilkowitch..	New York City	Reading, Pa.
Joseph Hirshfield	Kinston, N. C.	Kinston, N. C.
Joseph A. Hoffenberg..	Hartford, Conn.	Hartford, Conn.
M. E. Horenstein	Terre Haute, Ind.	Terre Haute, Ind.
Sol. Hurwitz	Cleveland, Ohio	Petaluma, Cal.
Minnie D. Isaacs	Louisville, Ky.	Louisville, Ky.
Bernard Jenkins	Chicago, Ill.	Oshkosh, Wisc.
Dr. George Jeshurun....	New York City	Dist. 1, N. Y.
Rabbi J. D. Jurman....	Waterbury, Conn.	Waterbury, Conn.
Isidore Kadis	Milwaukee, Wisc.	Sheboygan, Wisc.
I. Kahanowitz	Greensburg, Pa.	Greensburg, Pa.
Harry J. Kahn (alter-		
nate)	New York City	Patchogue, N. Y.
Dr. Horace M. Kallen..	New York City	Gloucester, Mass.
Nathan D. Kaplan.....	Chicago, Ill.	South Side District, Chicago
Boris Kazmann	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Memphis, Tenn.
L. Kneeter	Omaha, Nebraska	Omaha, Nebraska
Hyman H. Kronick ...	North Adams, Mass. ...	North Adams, Mass.
I. A. Lasser	Chicago Heights, Ill...	Chicago, Ill.
Alex Leitman	Norfolk, Va.	Norfolk, Va.
E. E. Lesitzky	New Orleans, La.	New Orleans, La.
Lotta Levensohn	New York City.....	Waco, Texas
Henry Levenson	Boston, Mass.	West End No. 8, Bos- ton, Mass.
Rabbi I. H. Leventhal..	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Central B'klyn Dist.
Isaac Levinson	Newport News, Va.	Newport News, Va.
Aaron Levinstone	Newark, N. J.	Newark, N. J.
Max Levy	Port Richmond, S. I....	Dist. 22, N. Y.
Mrs. Irma I. Lindheim..	New York City	Dist. 7, N. Y.
Leon J. Lipshitz.....	New York City	Dist. 27, B'klyn, N. Y.
I. Irving Lipsitch.....	San Francisco, Cal....	San Francisco, Cal.
Louis Lipsky	New York City	Middletown, Conn.
Chas. G. Lisowitz.....	Johnstown, Pa.	Johnstown, Pa.
Fred Lubin	Chicago, Ill.	Kenosha, Wisc.
Judge Julian W. Mack..	New York City	Mobile, Ala.

<i>Name</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>District Represented</i>
Sam Mackevich	Marinette, Wisc.	Marinette, Wisc.
Morris Marcus	Washington, Pa.	Washington, Pa.
Samuel Margolis	Dayton, Ohio	Dayton, Ohio
Rabbi Elias Margolis...	Mt. Vernon, N. Y.	Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
Morris Margulies	New York City	Dist. 12, N. Y.
William B. Marker.....	Chester, Pa.	Chester, Pa.
Julius Max	Sheybogan, Wisc.	Sheboygan, Wisc.
Israel N. Mehl	Ft. Worth, Texas	Ft. Worth, Texas
Dr. S. M. Melamed.....	Chicago, Ill.	West Side, Chicago, Ill.
Julius Meyer	Boston, Mass.	Back Bay and Down Town Districts
Israel I. Miller	Lorain, Ohio	Lorain, Ohio
L. H. Miller	Buffalo, N. Y.	Buffalo, N. Y.
Meyer Mintz	Springfield, Mass.	Bayonne, N. J.
Judge Jacob M. Moses.	Baltimore, Md.	Baltimore, Md.
Samuel J. Nathanson...	New Haven, Conn.....	New Haven, Conn.
Morris Neaman	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Dr. Abraham A. New-		Strawberry Mansion
man	Philadelphia, Pa.	District
Emanuel Neumann	Brooklyn, N. Y.	District 14, B'klyn, N. Y.
B. Nevelson	Mt. Vernon, N. Y.....	Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
Rev. Nathan D. New-		
mark	Scranton, Pa.	Scranton, Pa.
Samuel D. Ostrow.....	Erie, Pa.	Erie, Pa.
George Ozer	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dist. 18, N. Y.
Dr. L. M. Palitz.....	Savannah, Ga.	Savannah, Ga.
Harry Palthier	Providence, R. I.	Woonsocket, R. I.
Asher Papish	Danbury, Conn.	Danbury, Conn.
Louis Plost	Tulsa, Okla.	Tulsa, Okla.
Martin L. Pollack	New York City.....	Seattle, Wash.
Louis Posner	New York City.....	Topeka, Kansas
Jacob Promboin	Cambridge, Mass.	Cambridge, Mass.
Benj. Rabalsky	Boston, Mass.	West End No. 8, Bos- ton, Mass.
Meyer Reich	East Liverpool, Ohio...	East Liverpool, Ohio
Rev. M. Rein	Hurley, Wisc.	Lake Superior, Wisc.
Bernard G. Richards...	New York City	Berkley, Va.
Sam Rittenberg	Charleston, S. C.....	Charleston, S. C.
Louis Robison	New York City.....	Pensacola, Fla.
A. P. Rosenberg.....	Milwaukee, Wisc.	Dist. 2, Milwaukee
I. Rosenberg	Rochester, N. Y.	Rochester, N. Y.
M. G. Rosenberg.....	Ybor City, Fla.	Tampa, Fla.
Judge B. A. Rosenblatt.	Far Rockaway, L. I....	San Diego, Cal.
Sol Rosenbloom	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Pittsburgh, Pa.
S. J. Rosensohn	New York City	Dist. 6, N. Y.
Morris Rothenberg	New York City	Bethlehem, Pa.
Simon Rothenberg	New York City	Beloit, Wis.
I. H. Rubin	New York City	Hudson, N. Y.
J. I. Rudavsky	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Dist. 16, B'klyn, N. Y.
I. Rude	Denver, Colo.	Denver, Colo.

<i>Name</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>District Represented</i>
Charles Runovitch	Superior, Wisc.	Superior, Wisc.
Herman Ruwich	Crystal Falls, Mich.	Crystal Falls, Mich.
Samuel Sagarin	Pittsfield, Mass.	Pittsfield, Mass.
David R. Sandler	Atlantic City, N. J.	Atlantic City, N. J.
William Sauber	Green Bay, Wis.	Green Bay, Wis.
Albert Schlossberg	Huntington, W. Va.	Huntington, W. Va.
Max Schlossberg	Cleveland, Ohio	Chattanooga, Tenn.
S. S. Schwartz	Waukegan, Ill.	Waukegan, Ill.
Mrs. Peter J. Schweitzer	New York City	Stockton, Cal.
Peter J. Schweitzer	New York City	Key West, Fla.
Abraham A. Seligson	Arverne, L. I.	Dist. 36, N. Y.
Morris Senn	North Phila., Pa.	North Phila., Pa.
Morris Serber	Philadelphia, Pa.	Parkside Dist., Phila., Pa.
Hyman Shalman	New Haven, Conn.	Ansonia, Conn.
Simon Shamroth	Lynn, Mass.	Lynn, Mass.
Bernard Shelvin	New York City	Dist. 33, N. Y.
Max Shulman	Chicago, Ill.	Lawndale Dist., Ill.
Alfred Siegel	Brockton, Mass.	Brockton, Mass.
H. Siegel	Milwaukee, Wisc.	Dist. 1, Milwaukee, Wisc.
Harry L. Silk	Philadelphia, Pa.	West Phila., Pa.
Rabbi A. H. Silver	Cleveland, Ohio	Cleveland, Ohio
M. I. Silverman	Norwich, Conn.	Norwich, Conn.
Morris Silverman	Schenectady, N. Y.	Schenectady, N. Y.
Robert Silverman	Revere, Mass.	Revere, Mass.
Harry Silverstone	Bridgeport, Conn.	Bridgeport, Conn.
D. W. Simons	Detroit, Mich.	Detroit, Mich.
Meyer H. Slack	Haverstraw, N. Y.	Haverstraw, N. Y.
M. J. Slonim	Philadelphia, Pa.	North 22nd Street Dist., Phila., Pa.
Charles Smith	Providence, R. I.	Providence, R. I.
Mrs. Jacob Sobel	New York City	Somerville, N. J.
Miss Emily Solis		
Cohen (Alternate)	Philadelphia, Pa.	Philadelphia, Pa.
S. D. Solomon	Syracuse, N. Y.	Syracuse, N. Y.
Rabbi Leon Spitz	Charleston, W. Va.	Charleston, W. Va.
Philip Stein	Escanaba, Mich.	Escanaba, Mich.
H. Steinberg	Chicago, Ill.	North West Dist., Chicago, Ill.
Louis Stoll	Detroit, Mich.	Detroit, Mich.
Benjamin Stone	Mayfield Yards, Pa.	Carbondale, Pa.
Wm. Stone	St. Joseph, Mo.	St. Joseph, Mo.
S. Thau	New York City	Dist. 3, N. Y.
Louis Topkis	Wilmington, Del.	Wilmington, Del.
Isaac Tumpowsky	Bronx, N. Y.	Dist. 30, N. Y.
S. Tiegel	Paterson, N. J.	Paterson, N. J.
Nathan Straus, Jr.	New York City	Newport News, Va.
David Surdut	New York City	District 28, N. Y.

<i>Name</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>District Represented</i>
Abraham Swire	Albany, N. Y.	Albany, N. Y.
Robert Szold	New York City	East Boston, Dist. 11
Gussie Taussig	Hammond, Ind.	Hammond, Ind.
Reuben Taylor	Hartford, Conn.	Ellington-Rockville, Dist., Conn.
Isaac D. Teplow	Taunton, Mass.	Taunton, Mass.
Mrs. A. H. Vixman....	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Rabbi A. Volkman	Oil City, Pa.	Oil City, Pa.
Aleck E. Wagman.....	Dorchester, Mass.	Dorchester, Mass.
H. B. Walder.....	Plainfield, N. J.	Plainfield, N. J.
Arthur Weinberg	New York City	District 34, N. Y.
Mrs. Henry Weinstein.	Detroit, Mich.	Detroit, Mich.
Jacob Weinstein	Troy, N. Y.	Troy, N. Y.
Sol. Weinstein	New York City	Dist. 9, N. Y.
Meyer W. Weisgal	New York City	Long Branch, N. J.
Isaac Werne	Dallas, Texas	Dallas, Texas
Rabbi Harvey E. Wes- sel	Asheville, N. C.....	Asheville, N. C.
J. S. Willens	Nashua, N. H.	Nashua, N. H.
Paul Wintrob	Philadelphia, Pa.	Pt. Breeze Dist., Phila., Pa.
James W. Wise	New York City	Portland, Oregon
Dr. Stephen S. Wise...	New York City	Lowell, Mass.
Sol. L. Wisenberg....	Laurel, Miss.	Laurel, Miss.
Dr. Alexander S. Wolf.	St. Louis, Mo.	St. Louis, Mo.
I. Wolf	Indianapolis, Ind.	Indianapolis, Ind.
Israel I. Wolf	New York City	Dist. 25, N. Y.
Bert Wolman	Columbus, Ohio	Columbus, Ohio
Moses Zolman	Holyoke, Mass.	Holyoke, Mass.
Morris Zeldin	New York City.....	Dist. 15, N. Y.
Leon Zolotkoff	New York City.....	Iowa City, Iowa



BROOKLYN EAGLE PRESS

